CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE

THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

National Library of Canada
Collections Development Branch

Canadian Theses on
Microfiche Service

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction du développement des collections

Service des thèses canadiennes
sur microfiche

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

Canada

NL 339 (r. 85/09)

National Library of Canada / Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

TC –

ISBN 0-315-21302-7

108

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE SERVICE – SERVICE DES THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

PERMISION TO MICROFILM – AUTORISATION DE MICROFILMER

• Please print or type – Écrire en lettres moulées ou dactylographier

AUTHOR – AUTEUR

Full Name of Author – Nom complet de l'auteur

HUBBARD, LILLIAN ANN LOUISE

Date of Birth – Date de naissance
22/11/39

Canadian Citizen – Citoyen canadien
☑ Yes / Oui ☐ No / Non

Country of Birth – Lieu de naissance
CANADA

Permanent Address – Résidence fixe
HOLDEN, ALBERTA
T0B-2C0

THESIS – THÈSE

Title of Thesis – Titre de la thèse

KNOWLEDGE AND AWARENESS OF READING PROCESSES AND STRATEGIES OF CHILDREN IN A PLAY GROUP SETTING

Degree for which thesis was presented
Grade pour lequel cette thèse fut présentée
M.Ed.

Year this degree conferred
Année d'obtention de ce grade
1985

University – Université
UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

Name of Supervisor – Nom du directeur de thèse
DR. JEAN ROBERTSON

AUTHORIZATION – AUTORISATION

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to **microfilm** this thesis and to **lend** or **sell copies of the film.**

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de **microfilmer** cette thèse et de **prêter** ou de **vendre des exemplaires du film.**

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

ATTACH FORM TO THESIS – VEUILLEZ JOINDRE CE FORMULAIRE À LA THÈSE

Signature
Louise Hubbard

Date
April 12, 1985

NL-91 (4-84/03)

Canada

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

KNOWLEDGE AND AWARENESS OF READING PROCESSES AND STRATEGIES OF CHILDREN IN A PLAY GROUP SETTING

by

LILLIAN ANN LOUISE HUBBARD

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

IN

DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

© SPRING, 1985

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR Lillian Ann Louise Hubbard

NAME OF THESIS Knowledge and Awareness of Reading Processes and Strategies of Children in a Play Group Setting

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED Master of Education

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED 1985

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(Signed) Louise Hubbard

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

Holden, Alberta

TOB 2CO

DATED April 12, 1985

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Knowledge and Awareness of Reading Processes and Strategies of Children in a Play Group Setting" submitted by Lillian Ann Louise Hubbard in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

Joan E. Halbertson
Supervisor

Joyce Edwards

Jay Bishop

Date April 12, 1985

ABSTRACT

Numerous studies have been completed to determine the knowledge and awareness that children possess about the reading process. However, these studies have relied on the probe technique (Meyers & Paris, 1978) either with an altered or without a reading task (Weintraub & Denny, 1964-65). This study differed in that children were not questioned, nor were they inhibited by the presence of an adult. The study was undertaken with the researcher absent from the area in which the data were collected. The purpose of this study was to describe and analyze the knowledge and awareness of reading processes and strategies verbalized by groups of two children each as they taught E.T., a stuffed toy, to read. Thirty-six grade two students from two different schools within a county adjoining a large urban centre in Alberta participated in the study. They were introduced to a narrative at the grade one reading level which they could use in the assigned task if they so desired. The pupil's performances were audio- and videotaped so that the data could be transcribed, and analyzed in relation to the specific research questions. The study then, was a descriptive analysis of their verbalizations of their knowledge and awareness of reading processes and of their strategies. The results of the data indicated that the oral mode of presentation was the mainstay of student instruction and that students focussed on word identification. In addition, the data showed that the children were concerned with the smaller unit of the word to an almost exclusive ignoring of holistic interpretation of story. Hence, the incorporation of instruction about story structure--characters,

action, and outcome with the delineation of main ideas and supporting details should be a part of regular ongoing instruction in Reading. Other findings were reported, conclusions drawn and suggestions for further research advanced.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH PROBLEM	1
	PURPOSE OF STUDY	4
	DEFINITION OF TERMS	5
	RESEARCH QUESTIONS	6
	THE SAMPLE	7
	DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSES	8
	LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	9
	ASSUMPTIONS	10
	SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY	10
	OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY	11
	SUMMARY	11
II	RELATED LITERATURE	12
	PLAY	12
	LANGUAGE AS A TOOL	20
	DRAMA: ONE VEHICLE FOR DEVELOPING LANGUAGE	22
	CHILD'S CONCEPT OF READING	23
	THE NATURE OF READING	26
	RATIONALE FOR THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY	30
	TEACHING METHODS	34
	Multisensory Approach	34
	Alphabetic Approach	35
	Whole Word Approach	36
	Phonic and Phonetic Methods	37
	The Sentence Method	37

CHAPTER		PAGE
	ESTABLISHING CATEGORIES FOR THE ANALYSIS OF DATA AS REVEALED IN STUDENT VERBALIZATIONS	38
	SUMMARY	45
III	EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN	47
	RATIONALE FOR THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY	47
	THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENT	48
	THE PLAY AREAS	51
	STUDENT SAMPLE	52
	THE PILOT STUDIES AND THE EMERGENT DESIGN OF THE MAIN STUDY	52
	Stage One of Pilot One	53
	Stage Two of Pilot One	55
	Stage Two Procedure	55
	Stage Three of Pilot Study One	57
	ALTERATION IN PROCEDURE TO PILOT STUDY TWO AND MAIN STUDY	57
	PILOT STUDY TWO	58
	FIRST TEN MINUTE SESSION OF PILOT STUDY TWO IN SCHOOL ONE	58
	SECOND THIRTEEN MINUTE SESSION OF PILOT STUDY TWO IN SCHOOL ONE	64
	FIRST TEN MINUTE SESSION OF PILOT STUDY TWO IN SCHOOL TWO	69
	SECOND THIRTEEN MINUTE SESSION OF PILOT STUDY TWO IN SCHOOL TWO	71
	THE MAIN STUDY	74
	SUMMARY	75

CHAPTER		PAGE
IV	THE RESULTS OF THE DATA ANALYSES: FINDINGS OF THE STUDY . .	76
	PART ONE	76
	STUDENT SAMPLE	76
	Children's Reactions to Video and Audiotaping and E.T. .	77
	Description of Role Playing Activity	80
	PART TWO	81
	DESCRIPTION OF STUDENT VERBALIZATIONS ABOUT READING BY GROUPS OF TWO STUDENTS	81
	COMPILATION OF EPISODES	82
	Group 1: Andrew (N.P. 84) Chose Sonny (N.P. 40)	82
	Group 2: Krystal (N.P. 42) Chose Jane (N.P. 34)	83
	Group 3: Ann (N.P. 78) Chose Nicole (N.P. 87)	86
	Group 4: Samuel (N.P. 81) Chose Ralph (N.P. 34)	89
	Group 5: John (N.P. 67) Chose Mitchell (N.P. 42) . . .	94
	Group 6: Brenda (N.P. 36) Chose Junella (N.P. 75) . . .	98
	Group 7: Mary (N.P. 67) Chose Bernice (N.P. 34)	101
	Group 8: Kristopher (N.P. 59) Chose Charles (N.P. 73) .	105
	Group 9: June (N.P. 53) Chose Winnifred (N.P. 73) . . .	107
	Group 10: Elaine (N.P. 26) Chose Candice (N.P. 48) . .	110
	Group 11: David (N.P. 44) Chose Betty (N.P. 93)	112
	Group 12: Mark (N.P. 59) Chose Cordelaine (N.P. 48) . .	113
	Group 13: Ellen (N.P. 61) Chose Maria (N.P. 54)	114
	Group 14: Missy (N.P. 28) Chose Teresa (N.P. 91) . . .	115
	Group 15: Rolph (N.P. 57) Chose Junior (N.P. 77) . . .	117
	Group 16: Sandy (N.P. 59) Chose Roland (N.P. 54) . . .	117

CHAPTER		PAGE
	Group 17: Susan (N.P. 99) Chose Teresa (N.P. 91) . . .	120
	Group 18: Chester (N.P. 99) Chose Darwin (N.P. 20) . .	123
	PART THREE	129
	SYNTHESIS OF STUDY FINDIGNS BY TOTAL STUDENT SAMPLE AND DISCUSSION OF THOSE FINDINGS	129
	Student Knowledge and Awareness of Oral Mode of Reading (Category IV B)	129
	Student Knowledge and Awareness of Reading Strategies (Category III)	133
	Word Identification (Category III A)	133
	Comprehension (Catagory III B)	137
	Correcting Misconceptions (Category III D)	140
	Student Knowledge and Awareness of Conventions of Print (Category I)	141
	Reference to Letters, Words, Sentences, Paragraphs and Pages (Category I B)	141
	Student Knowledge and Awareness of Reading Processes (Category I)	143
	Attending to Text (Category II A)	143
	Associating Meaning to Words (Category II C) . . .	144
	Student Knowledge and Awareness of Concept of Reading (Category IV A)	148
	SUMMARY	149
V	SUMMARY, MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS OF STUDY	150
	SUMMARY OF STUDY	150
	MAJOR FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS BY RESEARCH QUESTION	151
	CLASSROOM IMPLICATIONS EMERGING FROM STUDY	154

CHAPTER PAGE

FURTHER RESEARCH 156

CONCLUDING STATEMENT 157

BIBLIOGRAPHY 159

APPENDIX A DEFINITIONS OF FEATURES USED IN CLASSIFYING RESPONSES TO QUESTION "A" IN THE VERBAL TASK ASSESSMENT 170

APPENDIX B INTRODUCTION TO E.T. AND PROJECT 172

APPENDIX C NARRATIVES FROM "ON CHERRY STREET" AND "RAINBOW LETTERS" 174

APPENDIX D CHILDREN'S SUGGESTIONS FOR ROLE PLAYING ACTIVITIES . . 178

APPENDIX E DESCRIPTION OF STUDENT SAMPLE 181

APPENDIX F TWO COMPLETE PERFORMANCES 183

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Description	Page
3.1	Readability of Reading Selections According to Fry	49
3.2	Student Samples in Pilot and Main Studies	54
4.1	Student Sample	78
4.2	Summary of Total Student Performance by Category	127

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

History reveals that regardless of the discipline the development of a theory generally reflects a modification and change of the original stance. Consider the work of the great mathematician Euclid (300 B.C.). For nearly two millenia, his postulational method not only dominated all teaching of geometry but stimulated mathematicians to question the logical foundations of the subject. This intense scrutiny resulted in the development of many aspects of modern mathematics including non-Euclidean geometries. Accordingly, the development of Lobachevskian geometry (1830), considered on a surface of constant curvature rather than the narrower Euclidean flat surface perspective, dealt a severe blow to the "absolute truth" viewpoint of mathematics "puncturing a traditional belief and breaking a centuries long habit of thought" (Eves & Newsom, 1958, p. 77).

As in the epoch of Euclid, today's developmental psychologists are modifying, questioning and rejecting certain features of Jean Piaget's theory of the nature of intelligence and the stages of intellectual growth. For example, Klaus Riegel (1979) did not merely criticise and question traditional psychology but advanced a new comprehensive and integrated conceptualization. He extended the theory of development to include the concept that mature thought in an individual could emanate

from any one of Piaget's four stages instead of progressing along a continuum through all the stages in turn.

In addition, Donaldson (1978) questioned the nature of Piaget's tasks--tasks which require deliberate mental awareness and control because they have to be considered out of context; that is, foreign to the child's experience. She argued further that Piaget's hypothesis that children under the age of six or seven have difficulty communicating because they cannot decentre or are highly egocentric is incorrect. She maintained though, that the child's thought processes are constrained by the adult's failure to communicate at the child's level of development. Therefore, the conclusion was that children's thinking and language have been grossly underestimated by adults (Bruner, 1975; Donaldson, 1978). Indeed, Donaldson (1978) argued that children have exhibited "beyond doubt a well-developed ability to make sense of a highly complex world" (p. 62). When children actively function in real life contexts (Donaldson, 1978) using their language to expand, clarify, and question their knowledge (Barnes, 1976) of meaningful tasks, their performances often extend to levels thought to be beyond them (Donaldson, 1978). Indeed, this researcher believes too, that children's thinking and their ability to verbalize their thoughts in an organized manner have been underestimated; therefore, further assessment is essential.

The child's awareness of her knowledge develops when she is given the opportunity to pause and consider the mental processes that are essential to achieve a goal. However, "extensive literature has shown that while adults and older children are often sensitive to metacognitive variables, children younger than eight years of age are less sensitive"

(Meyers & Paris, 1978, p. 680) but not insensitive. Research in this area needs to be extended because it has not recorded the utilization of small group discussion in a play setting as a vehicle to ascertain children's knowledge and awareness of processes such as reading. As reading is a multifaceted process, children must actively integrate many skills and abilities to derive meaning from print. One could imagine that a vision from the mind of the writer to the mind of the reader is communicated through the intermediary of written symbols (Gerhard, 1975). Essentially, however, communication between the author and the writer occurs when the reader intermeshes her past experiences with the author's intended meaning, simultaneously developing and/or elaborating present classification schemes. The embellished categorical schema aids both the storage and retrieval of experiences and knowledge which may be stimulated to recall by a variety of representational modes including print and pictures. However, it is equally important that the reader is able to verbalize the stored information through a reconstruction of knowledge of past experiences, present experiences, and the context in which it appears in the text.

Young children then, may be more sensitive than we realize and a medium such as small group discussion among children in a play setting may reveal more knowledge and awareness of reading processes and of their strategies than that for which they have been given credit.

Dramatization in a small group play setting is a realistic agent for the following reasons:

1. Piaget (1969) identified symbolic play as a process used naturally by children to assimilate new experiences. Reading is a new experience for young children.
2. According to Yamomoto (1979) children attain mastery over themselves and their environment through the medium of play. Playing "reading" may very well illuminate for the child, the processes and strategies she employs while reading.
3. Siks (1983) maintained that drama comes to school with children, although they do not know or care that it is called drama.

> What children care about are opportunities to join with others in actively expressing their thoughts, feelings, and imaginings. They want to act out some of their impressions in satisfying group experiences (Siks, 1983, p. 3).

4. From the researcher's experience, children in grade four attempted to teach writing and mathematics to a large stuffed toy which had been brought to the classroom to fill a vacant desk.

The problem then, is to explore children's knowledge and awareness of reading processes and strategies as children play in groups.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to describe and analyze grade two children's spontaneous verbalizations of their knowledge and awareness of reading processes and strategies as groups of two children each taught a large stuffed toy how to read.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Play was the spontaneous activity in which children naturally participated.

Sociodramatic Play was the cooperative elaboration with at least one other role player in which the children drew from their experience while imitating the person's behaviors and speech utilizing real or imagined objects (Smilansky, 1968).

In this study, sociodramatic play was reflected in a role playing activity in which two children assumed the role of teacher cooperatively and/or independently elaborating a real life experience (reading) with the aid of a large stuffed toy (E.T.).

Reading Processes were the underlying cognitive behaviors that readers engaged in as they derived meaning from print. Fagan (in preparation) identified the following processes which may not be independent one of the other: attending, analyzing, comparing/discriminating, associating sound to letters, associating meaning, predicting, inferring, synthesizing, monitoring, classifying and generalizing.

Reading Strategies were the large and diverse range of procedures a reader utilized to derive meaning from print. In this study, multisensory, alphabetic, whole word, phonic and phonetic and sentence categories were used to describe the different approaches the children utilized. In effect these were strategies taught to E.T. by the children and appear to be strategies that they have been taught in their reading.

Word Meanings were defined as:

1. Abstract Conceptual--A child who was able to consider ideas about ideas or to consider ideas that were possible with little reference to the concrete object or situation conveyed an abstract conceptual meaning.
2. Concrete--A child who named a real thing or class of things conveyed a concrete meaning.
3. Gestural--A child who utilized either non-verbal cues to develop the meaning of the word or who used E.T. to relate meaning by gesture conveyed a gestural meaning.
4. Functional--A child who incorporated a feature in her verbalization illustrating the use of the term conveyed a functional meaning.
5. Circular--A child who used a feature in her verbalization which was repeated as part of the definition conveyed a circular meaning.
6. Vague--A child who conveyed any definition that was not clearly one or more of one through five was considered vague.
7. Other definitions re: word meaning were obtained from the Lim-Alparaque Study (1983) and appear in Appendix A.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What knowledge and awareness is verbalized of reading processes as groups of grade two children teach E.T. to read in a play group setting?

2. What knowledge and awareness of reading stratetgies is exhibited by groups of grade two students as they teach a large stuffed toy, E.T. to read?

THE SAMPLE

The sample for the main study consisted of eighteen self-selected groups of two from designated classes of children for a total sample of thirty-six grade two students. These students were drawn from the population of grade two students in two different schools in a county adjoining a large urban centre in Alberta.

1. They were chosen from these schools which reflected a relatively stable mixture of both rural and urban students.
2. They had no serious sight, speech, hearing or emotional problems which could affect their ability to participate in group activities.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This descriptive study examined children's knowledge and awareness of reading processes and strategies through spontaneous play for the assigned task of teaching reading to a stuffed toy without an adult being present in the play area. Grade two children verbalized their knowledge and awareness of reading processes and strategies in a group play setting on two separate occasions utilizing the same story. Their verbalizations were audio- and videotaped. Two pilot studies were completed. One consisted of the classroom teacher's introduction of the designated story to the children of the main study. The other pilot study consisted of two practice runs and two episodes of teaching reading to E.T. These

pilot studies and the main study were initiated at both schools commencing the week of June 4, 1984. The practice runs were five minute episodes played on consecutive days in which the students participated in teacher role playing activities centered around predetermined themes none of which was a reading theme (Appendix B). Practice runs were undertaken to determine the degree of child interaction with the stuffed toy E.T. as well as to provide these students with an opportunity to function as groups of two. The episodes re: the teaching of reading to E.T. were considered essential as the children's verbalizations may not have reflected reading processes and strategies. In addition, the data were transcribed and analyzed to devise categories to consider the protocols of the main study. The main study initiated on June 7, 1984 was the actual teaching of reading to E.T. conducted to collect data re: reading processes and strategies in a play group setting as indicated by student verbalizations. The data from the main study were transcribed to describe and analyze children's knowledge and awareness of reading processes and strategies.

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSES

The test instrument was two narratives which could be utilized by the groups of children in their assigned task of teaching reading to E.T., a stuffed toy. In addition, paper and pencils were provided to be used if the children so desired. Audio- and videotaping of the students' performances provided the data required for the analyses. Two pilot studies were undertaken in each school in which groups of children were

audio- and videotaped. The data from the second pilot study were transcribed and analyzed into ideational units which identified observable criteria useable in the main study. The data from the main study were then collected, analyzed and reported according to these criteria.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Limitations are uncontrolled aspects of the study about which the researcher either has no control over or about which information is not available (Fox, 1969). The following aspects were considered limitations to the study.

1. The teaching methodology in practice by the respective teachers was not observed or considered as a variable in the study as the researcher deemed this variable to be outside the framework of this research. However, it is logical to assume that the teaching practices of each classroom teacher were reflected to some degree in the children's verbalizations.
2. Other research techniques have yielded information about many aspects of reading which may not be verbalized in the chosen technique of this study, spontaneous play by groups of two children each.
3. Verbal and non-verbal data were sometimes considered in concert on the videotapes; however, the primary analysis lay with the verbal data.

ASSUMPTIONS

An assumption reflects any uncontrolled aspect which is critical for the research to make sense (Fox, 1969). Therefore, the following aspects are reflective of an assumption.

1. The researcher interpreted the children's utterances in light of her own concepts of reading processes. The validity of this method of interpretation was based on the assumption that the researcher's background experience was more than adequate to identify and accurately describe the children's verbalizations.
2. The researcher assumed the children were reflecting accurately and optimally through play.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The significance of the study lies in grade two students naturally revealing knowledge and awareness of reading processes and strategies in a group play setting as they interactively teach a stuffed toy to read. To gain some knowledge of the level of verbalizations of grade two students' knowledge and awareness of reading processes in a small group situation without adult direction could initially give educators insights into the students' understandings of these reading processes and strategies about which they may not be fully conscious but may nevertheless be revealed to the researcher as they play. Accordingly, this information could give the teacher basic insights into the understandings of the students thereby assisting her to adjust teaching strategies in light of the students' knowledge. At this point, it is

important to re-state Donaldson's (1978) contention that children's thinking and language have been grossly underestimated by adults.

OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

In Chapter II, a review of the related literature is presented in order to establish validity for the design of the study in addition to providing a framework for analyzing the data. The design of the study is discussed in detail in Chapter III. Chapter IV reports the findings of the study and a discussion of the results. A summary of the study with implications, conclusions, and suggestions for further research is presented in Chapter V.

SUMMARY

This chapter has provided an overview of the research conducted by the investigator. The problem was presented and discussed. A research design was established to collect and analyze the necessary data. The student sample and the testing instrument were outlined. The limitations of the study were acknowledged and the possible significance of the study was presented.

CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE

Areas of research literature important to this study and addressed in turn included play, language as a tool, drama as one vehicle for language development, nature of reading, children's concepts of reading, rationale for the design of the study, teaching methods and related literature for establishing categories into which data from the study could be organized.

Rather than the awkward use of he/she and other similar references, children will be referred to as she.

PLAY

As the child participates in her natural environment of play, many educators and developmental psychologists suggest that skills in creativity and divergent thinking are developed. In this study, play was the primary medium through which groups of two children were afforded the opportunity to verbalize their knowledge and awareness of reading processes and strategies. It was hypothesized that through this milieu the child's optimal potential for expression and understanding would be demonstrated. This assumption is not novel because from the time of Plato, philosophers and educators have promoted the importance of play in the educational setting because prior to the child's entrance into

school, she is steeped in play which "is the natural avocation of childhood" (Weininger, 1979, p. 26).

Play represents the child's private reality, her world. Both theoretically (as Brunner, Jolly & Sylva, 1976; Piaget, 1969; Vygotsky, 1962) and practically (Nickolich, 1977) play is "one of the mediators children use to learn about their world" (Silvern & Williamson & Waters, 1983, p. 16). Because play is chosen freely, many observers may assume that children's activities appear to be insignificant and without purpose. However, children are actually seeking to discover the real world while "learning its space time properties, and physical relationships (Weininger, 1979, p. 51). Because of the child's natural inquisitiveness about her surroundings, she organizes her reality through her experiences with the environment as she plays.

Over the years, theorists have emphasized the value of play. Joseph Lee (1915, cited in Weininger, 1979) noted that play provided children with the opportunity for growth because through the natural medium of play the child can actively experience and therefore assimilate these experiences into existing schemata in meaningful ways. Weininger (1979) corroborated this stance thus:

> It is through play that they grow and the growth in turn acts as a stimulus to change through play which is learning. The relationship is a reciprocal totally integrated one play and growing—growing and play (p.46).

Play activity, therefore, affords the child the opportunity to construct and test her meaning within her natural environment—thus is a tremendous value to the child's overall intellectual development. In addition, play immerses the child in social situations whereby she communicates,

develops and refines language abilities. Accordingly, play is the child's life and the most productive way of learning--her most vital mode of communication (Piaget, 1969). As Arnaud (1971) pointed out, if children are put into a situation in which they have a real need to relate a message, their communication skills are enhanced. In this study, children in a play group setting communicated their knowledge and awareness of the reading processes as they taught E.T. how to read.

Several theorists have attempted to define play; however, their efforts have been confounded basically because of the complexity of the phenomenon. Endeavors to delineate the parameters of play have resulted in a fractionalization of the behavior with theorists generally dwelling on specific factors rather than on an overall theoretical conceptualization. Consider the "surplus energy theory" where play was defined as the "aimless expenditure of exuberant energy." Accordingly, the aimlessness of the behavior must be determined in light of the existence of surplus energy. In conjunction with the obvious difficulty of determining these specific characteristics of play, loopholes in the logic of the explanation are evident as indicated by the following example. Children will often play until exhausted, rest briefly, and then resume the activity with the same level of energy. Logically, children cannot regain surplus energy during the momentary respite. In addition, as mentioned previously, this definition of play examined one factor, the expenditure of energy during play and neglected an overall explanation of the phenomenon.

Ellis (1973) proposed an integration of several stances in order to define play and overcome obvious limitations of the existing significant

explanations. To begin with, evolution plays a major role on behavior in that the genotype reflects an accumulated composite of predispositions to adaptability and change. Accordingly, play behavior has adaptive significance as the inclination to play influences the playfulness of the child. As the child plays within the environment, experiences are broadened. With the greater experiential base, ability to adapt to change is heightened. However, stimuli in the environment which motivate change must be accompanied by feelings of euphoria. Huzinga (1949) called this way of feeling in play, ludia. According to Bishop (1982) "ludia covers that incredible way of feeling when the punchline of a joke is delivered, when a clever pun or play on words is suddenly understood" (p.38). Ellis (1973) maintained that the kinds of behaviors generated by such reinforcements--exploration, investigation, and manipulation--drive the individual to engage in ways over and above the basic needs for survival. Therefore, play is a process which fosters behavioral flexibility as the individual adapts to circumstances in the environment. "It involves both intrapsychic and interpsychic processing" (Bishop, 1982, p.38) with the child focussing on the actual "doing" of playing rather than the final outcome. With the accumulation of these experiences, behavior in turn is shaped resulting in an ever increasing complexity of continuous growth along which growing individuals move at approximately the same time. However Ellis (1973) maintained that because individuals have differing capactities to learn, differing abilities to engage in new interactions with the environment, and

differing applications of social consequences, a variability of individual development is evidenced.

Neumann succinctly outlined a set of criteria to evaluate the degree of playfulness of a behavior (see Ellis, 1973, pp.123-126). The closer the behavior is to meeting these conditions maximally, the more playful the behavior. "The criteria are locus of control of the player, the nature of the motive for the behavior, and the necessary constraints of reality" (Ellis, 1973, p.123). Generally, the player is in control of the behavior which is as free as possible from externally imposed constraints. As the child plays, satisfaction is associated with the intrinsically motivated process rather than with the product or endpoints. The "being" or the "doing" of playing reflect extensions of previous cognitive or imaginary experiences where reality and make-believe are intertwined.

The process of play becomes itself for itself then vanishes to be born again. Play creates itself (Bishop, 1985).

Role-playing, according to Cherry (1976) is the simplest form of play. The child transforms herself into people, objects, and situations often speaking through a make-believe friend, a puppet or a familiar object (Yawkey & Trostle, 1982). In this study, children participated in an activity where they assumed the role of teacher, teaching reading to a stuffed toy, E.T.

Roleplaying however, becomes sociodramatic when a cooperative elaboration of theme occurs between at least two role players (Smilansky, 1968). Smilansky (1968) outlined six play interdependent elements which are essential to a well-developed episode.

1. The child undertakes a make-believe role expressing herself through either imitative actions and/or verbalization.
2. Movements or verbalizations are substituted for real objects.
3. Verbal descriptions are substituted for make-believe actions and situations.
4. At least two people interact within the framework of the play episode.
5. The play episode continues for at least ten minutes.
6. Verbal interaction is related to the play episode.

In this study, all six elements were incorporated in each episode. The most central element which entered into the play episodes was one of non-reality--of make-believe where the child attempted to talk and/or look like an older real person and/or assumed the role of E.T., an imagined alien. By allowing the child an opportunity to enter into the adult world through play activities, inner satisfaction resulted because she assumed the dominant role. In addition, through this activity the child imitated both actions and speech not only of the teacher but of E.T., the student, for approximately ten minutes. However, her verbalization was pragmatic as well in that it was utilized to explain, embellish, discuss, or command actions necessary for the episode to progress. While the children interactively communicated ideas during the play episodes, they attempted to put as much true-to-life detail interspersed in the elaboration of the prescribed theme. However, the transition from reality to imagination or conversely from imagination to reality was aided by objects or pivots (Vygotsky, 1962). Pulaski (1973)

suggested that for children five through eight years of age, these objects were generally simply structured materials such as blocks, clay, and/or rag dolls. The objects became a link between the child and her environment providing an intermediary for interactive communication with either adults or other children (Garvey, 1977). While utilizing objects in a familiar setting, re-enactments reflected the groups' experiences. For example, visiting the doctor, playing school, or re-creating ideas from books and television (Yawkey & Trostle, 1982) mirrored the child's immediate milieu. Direct concrete experiences became part of the child's hierarchical mental schema of meaning giving rise to a categorical organization of ideas (Piaget, 1969). In this study, teaching reading represented a direct concrete experience which was familiar to the child. E.T., the stuffed toy, provided the channel for the experience.

Children benefit from the re-exploration of themes because with each investigation they develop a wider range of experience upon which to structure the re-enactment. Lowndes (1970) suggested that it is essential that children explore these themes with friends with whom they normally play because their vocabularies will be similar. Moffett (1973) theorized that younger children required the masking of borrowed clothes to create more freely. However, he further suggested that children are not interested in performing before others, as they become considerably inhibited and do not perform well.

In this study, teaching reading to a stuffed toy, E.T., afforded groups of grade two children with the familiar direct experience of teaching reading without direct observation or the presence of an adult

for both performances. In addition, the researcher hypothesized that the dual experience would assist the development of the students' knowledge and awareness of reading processes and strategies thus enabling the researcher to observe a greater elaboration of their verbalized cumulative knowledge.

A study conducted by Beth-Halachmy (1980) revealed that during recess periods children spent the greatest amount of time interacting in relatively small groups of two to five children and the least time alone. However, Moffett (1973) contended that performance groups consisting of four or five children resulted in uneven conversation whereby one or two children often became the leaders and did not allow the other children an opportunity to participate. He suggested further that trios tended to split into a situation reflecting two against one. Parten, (1971) however stated that "the most popular size for play groups was two" (p. 84). It was noted though, that once a group was established Moffett (1973) proposed that children required the experience of repeated group performances in order to build up a sense of identity and cooperative action.

Beth-Halachmy's (1980) research also revealed that children in primary grades tended to mix with either sex and generally participated in games which were not rule bound. Slade (1971) further suggested though that boys and girls should not be forced to work together as this procedure would undermine the fundamental basis of role playing, namely cooperation. In this study, children at the grade two level were given the liberty to self-select into groups of two children of either one or

both sexes. The number two arbitrarily chosen by the researcher was manageable and acceptable (Beth-Halachmy, 1980; Moffett, 1973; Parten, 1971; Slade, 1971). In addition, the self-selected groups of students were given the opportunity to work together as a group on four separate occasions:

1. Two practice sessions where the students taught E.T. something other than reading, and
2. Two main study runs which consisted of two separate episodes conducted within a ten day period.

LANGUAGE AS A TOOL

Oral language establishes relationships between individuals by creating situations where they interactively test the knowledge they possess with another's conceptualization. As stated by Fries (1963)

> All language concerns itself with meanings. Or perhaps we should say that human beings are basically concerned with meanings and use language as their tool to grasp, and comprehend and to share meanings (p. 97).

Language, therefore is a tool for individuals to explore and derive meaning, a resource which serves a variety of purposes.

Dillon (1983) summarized the major function of language thus:

> A major role of our language is to shape our experience to give it structure so that our world will make sense (p. 549).

The assumption that language is a tool for communicating existing meaning as well as for generating and elaborating meaning is not a recent notion. Vygotsky (1962) concluded that "the child's intellectual growth is contingent on his mastering the social means of thought, that is

language (p. 51). Additionally, he postulated that shared communication between two individuals resulted in internalized verbal thought.

In the educational setting, students participating in small groups may express their knowledge in light of present understandings without the restriction of anticipated adult responses. Therefore, their verbal communication reveals the level of thinking in that particular situation. They are forced to stop and think, reflecting on their current knowledge. Accordingly, awareness will typically develop when something makes the individual pause and consider the possibilities--that is, instead of just acting, all possibilities which are before one are considered (Donaldson, 1978).

Grade two students in this study were so encouraged and therefore the researcher hypothesized that in a role playing situation, they would be stimulated to consider what they knew about reading processes and strategies and would reveal this knowledge as they taught E.T. Language used in this manner could hasten the movement from vagueness of thought to precision in thought (Berry, 1982). Expression of an idea usually results in a clarified sharpened perception. With the refined perception, the child's ability to express is heightened. In this study, children could interactively relate information and thus refine concepts while teaching E.T. to read.

DRAMA: ONE VEHICLE FOR DEVELOPING LANGUAGE

Children are naturally involved in role playing activities from a very early age (Piaget, 1969; Smilansky, 1968). Therefore, when they come to school, their natural dramatic abilities are present. Through spontaneous participation in dramatic activity, they are motivated to use their own personal store of knowledge to communicate ideas meaningfully. Provision of situations for exploration allow children to operate in the context of real feelings and opinions while interactively utilizing active rather than passive vocabulary. Children are challenged to think on their feet and compose as they interact. Therefore, they experience purposeful language in dramatic activity, especially in role playing. Children work and re-work their knowledge, extending vocabulary while developing skills and versatility in language. Hence, the development of oral language proficiency is one of the strongest contributions evolving because of the child's participation in dramatic activity.

In this study, dramatization of the theme of teaching reading in which a group of two students collectively assumed the role of teacher in a play setting provided grade two children with an opportunity to verbalize their knowledge and awareness of reading processes and strategies. In addition, the cumulative experience of teaching reading to the stuffed toy on two separate occasions may very well have enhanced the findings of the study.

Most dramatic play is fun while allowing the children the means of exploring activities and relationships in the adult world. Cohen & Stern (1978) outlined in question form types of child behavior and interaction which would be evident in children's dramatic play.

1. What roles does the child take in dramatic play?
2. In playing roles, what position does the child take in relation to others?
3. Does she always assume one position? (Cohen & Stern, 1978, p. 94).

These questions of Cohen & Stern's were utilized by the researcher as a framework to examine collectively certain identifiable behaviors evidenced on the videotaped performances of the children's role playing activity of teaching E.T. to read.

CHILD'S CONCEPT OF READING

Reading is a very complex process and as such certain cognitive processes are set in motion as the child listens to or reads print. During this intercommunication, meaningful information is integrated into the child's existing schema. Hence, the child's "theory of the world" (Smith, 1971) gains in both scope and magnitude which continues to mushroom throughout her lifetime of interactive communication. "Reading then is the art of transmitting the ideas, facts and feelings from the mind and the soul of an author to the mind and soul of a reader, with accuracy and understanding" (Jennings, 1965, p. 11).

Traditionally, teaching children to read appears to be one of the central tasks of education in the elementary classroom. Accordingly, instruction begins with what the child knows. Therefore, to discover the

child's knowledge and awareness about print provides a base for further instruction. However, differences of opinion arise among educators, psychologists, and teachers as to the philosophy underlying the approach to instruction.

Indeed, some believe that adults can structure children's thoughts and actions through instruction, modelling appropriate behaviors, and correcting their mistakes. Many individuals are not impressed with this stance, believing instead that children have an inner need to perfect certain capacities and will therefore, seek out experiences to satisfy these needs (Crain, 1980). Regardless of their philosophy, both groups would agreed that all meaningful learning must be based on what the child knows. However, children come to school with varying levels of literacy, a direct reflection of their oral facility, the significance of print in the home, and the degree of immersion in that (print) environment. Accordingly, several researchers have attempted to delineate young children's accumulated knowledge of print. Of particular importance is the work of Marie Clay (1972) who on the basis of her observations of preschoolers and beginners has devised a "Concepts about Print Test." In this test, she has included basic literacy concepts such as, "Show me the front of the book. . . . Where do I begin? . . . Show me just one word." Her research and that of others has shown that the child's understanding of these concepts is fundamental to her growth in reading (Downing, 1976; Johns, 1977; Reid, 1966) and that these concepts develop from actual experience with language and with print. Indeed, the crucial factors in reading readiness include letter recognition and naming, familiarity with

written dialect including the special vocabulary of books, awareness of fundamental conventions of print, auditory discrimination of language, and a knowledge of the basic terms of instruction (Clay, 1979; Downing, 1976; Hardy, 1974; Robinson, 1980).

Several other studies have examined children's concept of reading from preschool age through to grade eight using the interview or probe (Canney & Winograd, 1979; Meyers & Paris, 1978; Reid, 1966-67). For example, to the question, "What is reading?" (Weintraub & Denny, 1964-65) grade one responses varied from "I don't know," to "I would say it's words and you sound them out if you don't know them" to "Reading is how to read and how to learn things and it helps you to learn things and to learn to read." Of significance are the responses to the question "What do you have to do to learn to read in first grade?" Only about one quarter of the responses indicated that "children saw themselves as taking some action in learning to read" (Weintraub & Denny, 1964-65, p. 446). The other responses were either vague or suggested a reliance on an older person.

In this study, grade two children had an opportunity to reveal their knowledge of reading processes and strategies through the activity of teaching a stuffed toy to read.

In summary then, according to Koste (1978), any individual who works with children needs to draw upon child's play, the natural dramatic root of improvisation, role playing, or creative drama. In addition, Huizinga (cited in Koste, 1978) suggested that play reveals the conscious and

unconscious of children. Freud (1965) elaborated further that language preserves the relationship between the child's perception of his world and the re-arrangement of that perception during play.

It appears then that play is the child's milieu, language the vehicle to unveil the conscious and the unconscious, and dramatization the medium for the child's explorations into life experiences where she assumes various roles and challenges herself with all sorts of problems without fear of failure. In this projected study, groups of grade two children in a play group setting assumed the role of teacher (dramatization) as they taught a stuffed toy to read (a language activity) is representative of the world and the activities of the child--the child in her natural setting.

THE NATURE OF READING

Reading is a multivariate activity--the art of reconstructing from the printed page the writer's ideas, feelings, moods and sensory impressions into a meaningful interpretation. Huey (1908) maintained that

> The ability to read is the most remarkable specific performance that civilization has learned in all its history (p. 6).

It is now known that children come to school with varying degrees of knowledge of print (Clay, 1972) but it is not known when reading actually begins. However, researchers would agree that reading in its embryonic stage is encapsulated in the individual's environment. Jennings (1965) summarized this stance thus:

> It . . . begins with the wonder at the world about us. It starts with the recognition of repeated events like thunder, lightning, and rain. It starts with food or water. It occurs when time is discovered. Reading begins with the management of signs of things. It begins when the mother holding the child's hand says that a day is beautiful or cold or that the wind is soft. Reading is the signs and portents, the flight of birds, the changing moon, the changeless sun and the fixed stars that move through the night. Reading is the practical management of the world about us (p. 3).

The knowledge that the child accumulates from experiences has a direct influence on what she gleans from print. In the words of Paulo Friere (1983), "reading the world precedes reading the word and the subsequent reading of the word cannot dispense with continually reading the world" (p. 5). That is, life experiences and amassed knowledge, for example, knowledge of language and of strategy and metacognition, continue to exert an influence on reading. From this stance, then

> reading is viewed as an integrated activity in which the reader's prior knowledge aids the interpretation of print and the interpretation of print influences the nature of prior knowledge that is brought to bear in constructing the author's message (Fagan, in preparation, p. 11, 12).

In order to construct meaning from this encounter with text, the reader uses certain covert cognitive processes that are not hierarchical in nature but integrated into a fine intermeshing of skill and strategy. For example, when a proficient reader encounters a very difficult word while preparing for an oral presentation, the individual will generally resort to using the strategy of attending to the graphophonic characteristics of that particular word. The word is analyzed and sound is associated with the letter or phoneme cluster. These are synthesized and an attempt can be made to pronounce the word correctly. By returning the word to its setting, the reader takes a risk using predictive strategies and context clues to monitor or evaluate the correctness of

the word. This esoteric interweaving of skills and strategies must become so automatic that the reader is able to devote most of her energy to deriving meaning from the printed page. In other words, as an individual reads, she makes use of three kinds of information:

1. graphophonic (letters, spelling patterns, phonics, orthographic units)
2. syntactic (sentence patterns)
3. semantic (prior knowledge used by the reader to reconstruct meaning derived from print into existing concepts).

"When all three kinds of information are utilized in concert" (Pearson, 1976, p. 310) with a degree of automaticity, "real reading occurs" (Pearson, 1976, p. 310), that is, the reader comprehends.

In conjunction with having various strategies to process print, the reader must also know how to interrelatedly utilize these strategies in an effective, intelligent manner. Metacognition is a term that has been introduced to refer to the knowledge and the control a student has over her own cognitive processes, that is, the awareness of knowledge of the system of strategies one can use to derive meaning from print (Brown, 1975; Flavell, 1981). Researchers (Brown, 1975; Clay, 1973; Markman, 1979; Piaget, 1969) suggested that young children are generally poor at metacognitive skills. Although children apply various reading skills, they are not aware of what they are doing and therefore, unable to monitor their activities.

According to Bruner (1975), the child's ability to direct her attention to the code upon which communication is based is the metalinguistic function of language. It is but one of the many functions

of language that children must be aware of in order to communicate. Mattingly & Kavanagh (1972) referred to children's acquired syntactic knowledge of language as linguistic awareness, a fundamental element in learning to read. However, many investigators view linguistic awareness to be multifaceted. Holdaway (1979) presented a very clear outline of the components of linguistic awareness in his description of the literacy set.

a. Motivational factors include the child's expectations of print that is, whether the child is curious about print and seeks experiences.

b. Linguistic factors include the familiarity with written aspects and include such things as knowledge of syntax, vocabulary and idiom.

c. Operational factors include the child's ability to use context to predict words, follow the plot, self-correct, and monitor.

d. Orthographic factors include the child's knowledge of the conventions of print. For example; left-to-right progression, knowing the function of punctuation marks and the phonetic principles.

Although Holdaway (1979) stressed the importance of the reader knowing that print rather than pictures conveys the story, one cannot overlook the significance of the inclusion of pictures in basal readers. Despite the controversy surrounding the utility of pictures in text in that it is suggested that pictures detract attention away from print, it should be noted that pictures cannot only help students acquire concepts from printed material but can also increase the amount of meaningful information accumulated without encouraging or permitting complete dependence upon the pictures to tell the story (Brody, 1981).

However, in the final analysis, learning in any area is directly related to the amount of practice done on whatever it is the individual is trying to learn (Doakes, 1979). Therefore if a child is learning to read, she will learn to read by reading extensively. Hopefully, pictures will enhance this experience.

In this study grade two children would be afforded the opportunity to verbalize their knowledge and awareness of reading processes and strategies in a group play setting for description and analysis by the researcher.

In developing the design for this study, the investigator has considered various aspects of research to provide a rationale, that is, an underlying reason or basis of controlling principles to formulate an explanation for the choice of this particular design.

RATIONALE FOR THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Researchers have generally gained information about various aspects of reading by interviewing children, audiotaping their answers, and then categorizing their transcribed verbalizations according to commonalities. In using this technique, researchers have relied upon a limited number of posed probes (Garner & Reis, 1980; Pearson & Johnson, 1980) or an interview schedule (Garner & Kraus, 1981-82; Meyers & Paris, 1978; Reid, 1966) with or without a definite reading task. Several researchers, then have attempted to delineate young children's accumulated knowledge of print--from reading concepts as general as feelings about reading (Weintraub & Denny, 1965) to the more specifically posed questions of

Johns (1972), "What is reading?" The findings of John's study placed the children's responses in one of five categories: 1) no response, vague or irrelevant, 2) classroom procedure, 3) word recognition, 4) meaning or understanding, and 5) meaning and word identification. Results indicated a significant positive correlation between the child's description of reading and reading achievement. However, as with all responses, they should be considered and interpreted cautiously as it is difficult to envision one aspect of reading to demonstrate generalizability of knowledge to such a broad concept.

In 1978, McLaughlin individually interviewed sixty first-grade children. The purpose of this investigation which included children from three different classrooms marked by procedural differences in instruction was to determine the children's concept for the purpose for reading. Results indicated that first grade children's purpose was not related to meaning. The teacher's failure to establish a purpose for reading may very well have been a contributing factor to the children's lack of understanding that reading is a meaning-getting process. In addition, Downing (1970) and Reid (1966) both examined children's perceptions of reading through open-ended questions. It was their conclusion that children were generally confused not only about linguistic concepts such as letter or word, but also revealed considerable confusion because of their lack of knowledge of instructional terms.

The utilization of the probe technique as a medium to ascertain the levels of children's knowledge and awareness of reading processes and strategies has been a source of controversy. Recently for example, McGarrigle (cited in Donaldson, 1978) using four cows experimented with six-year-old children. He laid four cows, three of them black and one of them white, all in a sleeping position. He then explained that all the cows were sleeping before he asked the following two different forms of questions:

1. Are there more black cows or more cows? (the Standard Piagetian form), and
2. Are there more black cows or more sleeping cows? (Donaldson, 1978, p. 40).

For both questions the situation was identical however, the differences occurred in the wording or the difficulty of the question. Both questions required the child to classify a sub-class from the whole class. However, the responses to the first type of question led Piaget to hypothesize that the child was unable to view the whole class and its parts simultaneously. McGarrigle in the second question increased the child's attention on the total class by including the adjective "sleeping." Inclusion of this focus resulted in a significant statistical difference in the experiment. Twenty-five percent of the group answered question one correctly whereas forty-eight percent of the group gave the correct response to question two. Accordingly, Donaldson (1978) concluded that "the questions the children were answering were

frequently not the question the experimenter asked" (p. 46). In other words a miscommunication occurred between the questioner and the questionee because the children did not interpret the meaning of the question as the questioner intended. Simpson's (1976) study also underlined this point. She reported that kindergarten children were able to make the same types of inferences as second and fourth graders in oral storytelling but experienced more difficulty in answering specifically posed inference questions.

However, Cazden (1972) suggested that gaps may occur in children's verbalized knowledge despite the methodology utilized. She stated that,

> If a particular construction does not appear in a certain transcription of the child's speech, is it missing from the child's linguistic competence or only from this sample of his performance? (p. 31).

Accordingly, this present study examined the verbalizations of Grade two children during an assigned teaching task without the presence of an adult in the play area to ascertain their knowledge and awareness of reading processes and strategies. However, the researcher must admit that the methodology used in this study may not reveal knowledge and awareness of reading processes and strategies for the same reason expressed by Cazden above. That is, the sample of children's verbal interactions taken in limited play time in this study may not happen to include all the children knew.

TEACHING METHODS

In this study, children assumed the role of teachers necessitating a review of teaching methodologies.

Researchers have explored the nature of teaching methodologies with the hope of finding the most proficient approach to teaching of reading. However, Chall (1983) argued that research on methodological approaches to beginning reading has yielded nothing consistently as to the model method of instruction. Durkin (1983) supported Chall's position stating that no single approach to teaching reading meets the needs of all children. In this study, it was considered reasonable to expect that the children's verbalizations would reflect a variety of teaching methodologies.

Multisensory Approach

Grace Fernald (cited in Holdaway, 1979) developed a multisensory approach to teaching reading and spelling to children who were experiencing difficulties with these disciplines. This methodology which synthesized elements of visual, auditory, kinesthetic, and tactile modes in literacy learning focussed on the child's modality strength as she "realized that perception is a matter of meanings seeking expression through any channel that is open" (Holdaway, 1979, p. 31). With subsequent research though, opinion was divided as to the effectiveness of this methodology. However, several reports of the successful use of

Fernald's technique has resulted in adaptations to her approach as well as the development of specific testing instruments to determine whether a child learns most efficiently through the visual, phonic or auditory, kinesthetic or a combination of sensory modes. Accordingly,

> research has shown that approximately thirty percent of elementary school age children have a visual modality strength, twenty-five percent have an auditory strength, and fifteen percent are kinesthetically oriented. The remaining thirty percent have mixed modality strength (Barbe & Milone, 1980, p. 45).

The following approaches reflect the use of different modality strengths in teaching methodologies.

Alphabetic Approach

The alphabetic approach to reading exemplifies the utilization of learning through the visual sensory mode. In this approach, the child is taught by rote to visually discriminate details of the letters in order that she can recognize and name the letters. After mastering the alphabet, the child is introduced to a series of progressively more complicated words gradually increasing in syllabic length (Caldwell, 1959). Before any attempt is made to pronounce the syllabic unit, the child is taught its spelling. With this knowledge, she is expected to attempt a pronunciation of an unknown word after applying the strategy of spelling out the word letter by letter. The alphabetic approach to teaching reading reflects the reading processes of attending, analyzing, discriminating and synthesizing. Because of the nature of the training received, that of being consciously aware of the details of words, readers may not develop an understanding of content. However, they do learn left-to-right progression in word recognition (Caldwell, 1959).

Whole Word Approach

Another methodology which focussed on the visual modality was developed by the Gestalt psychologists. They suggested that a reader immediately perceives whole words rather than single letters or parts; therefore, the child should recognize at sight the majority of words in a passage by their form and configuration. Gray (1956) referred to this methodology as the see-and-say method as pictures were employed during the presentation of the word. After repeated drill, the children were able to call the word eventually recognizing enough words to produce sentences.

However, this method was inadequate because children were unable to analyze polysyllabic words and were definitely lacking in spelling ability. Accordingly, the processes of attending and discrimination would essentially be utilized by the reader to enunciate the word with evaluative monitoring a possible factor in the actual act of word recognition.

Phonic and Phonetic Methods

By devoting instructional procedures to a combined modality, strengths and weaknesses of each individual child would be accommodated. The phoneme (sound unit) is the basic unit of instruction. Through this method, the child learned the sound(s) associated with the letter(s). This is representative of the application of combined visual and auditory modalities. For example, when a strange word is encountered, the reader is expected to sound out and blend the letters to approximate the correct pronunciation of the word. In order to complete this task, the child must recognize the letter(s) (visual discrimination) and associate the correct corresponding sound(s) (associating sound to letters). At a later stage, the reader attempts to apply the rules of syllabication and associate the correct sound to the larger syllabic unit. The reading processes attending, analyzing, discriminating, synthesizing and monitoring are exemplified through this approach to teaching.

The Sentence Method

Holdaway (1979) outlined a methodology which is based on the premise that "the smallest meaningful unit of language is the sentence and that real reading must begin there since only when meaning has been created has reading occurred" (p. 28). This however, is not an innovative methodology as Huey (1908) urged that the sentence should be the mainstay

of instruction. By focussing the reader's attention to sentence wholes and sentence meaning, the reader was no longer overly concerned with attention to letters, sounds, words and word meanings. Sentences were usually student generated based on familiar objects or pictures (Caldwell, 1959). Identification of words occurred as a result of the child's use of her knowledge of the language—the context clues providing information to the reader to predict a possible word. In this study, multisensory, alphabetic, whole word, phonic and phonetic, and sentence categories were used to describe the different approaches the children utilized.

ESTABLISHING CATEGORIES FOR THE ANALYSIS OF DATA AS REVEALED IN STUDENT VERBALIZATION

In this study, the children's verbalization reflected their concern for language as a tool—the development of word meanings. Therefore, it was essential to reveiw literature related to the development of word meanings in order to derive descriptors for classification of the data.

Considerable research has been devoted to the acquisition of word meanings; however, it is not clear how word knowledge necessary for adult performance comes about. Seiler & Wannenmacher (1983) stated that "it is difficult to construct a comprehensive and straightforward theory of word meaning acquisition" (p. 324). Cromer (1983) corroborated this stance suggesting that a gradual learning assumption could not totally account

for the acquisition of word knowledge as there appears to be an underlying reorganization process enmeshed. . . . "How or why this reorganization occurs remains a mystery" (p. 52). However, researchers would agree that word meanings evolve through the child's life experiences. Experience though, cannot be directly shared because thought is an internal process not directly observable. However, its existence can be inferred through the examination of the individual's speech. Vygotsky (1962) stated that "thought is born through speech." Similarly, he emphasized the importance of the connection between thought and language thus:

> Thought is not merely expressed in words; it comes into existence through them (p. 125).

Accordingly, Vygotsky considered the child's languaging in a social setting as the primary context to discovering its symbolic function. However, before the individual can communicate her thoughts and ideas, experiences must be generalized through associations with categories of experiences. Palermo (1983) stated:

> The person comes to know the structures primarily through the senses and creates the meaning for that structure in terms of a theory of the world (p. 301).

Piaget (1969) further suggested that humans initially represent the objects and their environment through their actions. From then on, the individual through the processes of internalization and reconstruction acquires the building blocks for the early cognitive structures of

operational thought. Through a slow interactive process of assimilation and accommodation, adjustments and changes are made to these initial structures. However, Klaus Riegel (1979) although recognizing the dialectical base revealed in Piaget's accommodation and assimilation paradigm leading to adaptation and readaptation argued that Piaget excluded this base from all other stages of development except the sensorimotor stage. Riegel pointed out that during Piaget's experimental observations, he posed problems and directed questions to children in order to explore their cognitive operations. However, he omitted at least one half of the mental processes of child development because he neglected to allow the child the opportunity to raise questions or to consider the problems he posed in a socially interactive situation with two or more individuals. Riegel (1979) stated "By restricting his [Piaget's] analysis to the interaction of the subject with objects, he succeeded in describing the logic of stages in rational thinking but failed to elaborate the basis of cognitive operations, the social basis of human beings" (p. 5). Furthermore, he suggested that the linear progression purported by Piaget is seldom evident and development appears to be characterized by a disequilibrium. That is, even though higher levels of mental growth may have been attained, lower or more primitive levels of thought may be apparent in the event of novel or different tasks. Werner & Kaplan (1950) supported this stand stating that "mental

growth rather than being conceived as a straight increase of achievement is here seen as a sequence of rises and declines of processes subserving each achievement" (p. 96).

Similarly, they indicated in a later publication that a linear progression is not often apparent in the development of word meaning.

> At a certain point in development, words come to acquire meanings relatively independent of specific concrete contents of application, that is, words become lexicalized. This process of establishing a stable relatively general meaning for words, a meaning which transcends specific significances of a word in different contexts is a long and difficult one (Werner & Kaplan, 1963, p. 190).

This stance was corroborated by the findings in research conducted by Russell & Sandeh (1962). Their study revealed that younger children's (grade three) definitions were dominated by concrete and functional choices. In later grades (six and nine) there was a decline in concrete choices and an increase in the number of functional and abstract definitions. Of particular significance however, is the fact that older children continued to rely on concrete choices to define words. From these findings, the researcher generalized that grade two children in this study would verbalize definitions reflecting concrete and functional choices.

Traditionally however, evidence of the attainment of a concept of a word has been associated with the individual's ability to verbalize this knowledge. Seiller & Wannenmacher (1983) summarized the abstract nature of a concept thus:

> (It) refers only to internal representation while retaining a minimal independence from the concrete situations and actions to which they relate (p. 322).

Accordingly, it was logical to assume that within this framework of abstractness, verbalized meaning would exhibit varying degrees of complexity--a direct result of the quality and quantity of the child's past experiences.

The most primitive or lowest level of meaning representation is mirrored in the child's circular verbalization of relating the word to the object (Fagan, in preparation). For example, a child might define a hillside thus: a hillside is a hillside. In addition, a child may verbalize a vague meaning association for a word because her experiences with the concept have not afforded her the opportunity to refine and clarify the meaning. For this study then, the most primitive abstract verbalizations of the children's meaning associations were categorized under the descriptors circular and vague.

In a recent study conducted by Fagan & Hayden (1983) with five-year-olds, the results indicated that one of the first features that a child acquired about a concept is that of its function. These findings corroborated the conclusions of earlier studies as evidenced in a paper by Feifel and Lorge (1950) where the results of Terman's (1916) study were summarized. Terman found that six-year-old children defined words in terms of their function and it was not before they were eight years of age that two-thirds of the children spontaneously verbalized definitions in terms superior to use. Accordingly, as the child has opportunities to organize and internalize experiences, it has been hypothesized by McFetridge (1971) that the child's verbalized meanings reflected an

increasing number of criterial properties. This stance is similar to the findings of Lorge & Feifel (1950)

> Significant differences were established between qualitative responses given by the younger children as against those used by older children. The younger children significantly more often employed the use and description, and illustration, demonstration, inferior explanation and repetitious types of response, whereas the older children significantly more often used the synonym and explanation types of responses (p.17).

Johnson and Pearson (1978) outlined a system for organizing word meanings according to the linked mutual relationship of class, example, and property relations.

Animals, cats, and pets, are examples of concepts based on common elements. For example, cats belong to a class of things called animals and could belong to a class of things called pets. However, an individual cat called Sylvester is an example of a particular category of cat--animated cartoon cat. In addition, cats as a class have certain properties, attributes, or commonalities. They have fur, are mammals, and purr. However, differences may occur in the extensiveness of the child's verbalized elaboration of the meanings--differences which mirror the depth and variety of the child's experiential background with the concept.

According to Jennings (1965)

> Words are slippery things. They won't stay put. They pick up meanings and colors not "intended" for them. They suffer or profit by the company they keep. In the mouth of one man the word love can be a plea. Other lips can make it a curse. Its meaning can be reduced to the equivalent of like or expanded to mean worship (p. 20).

There seems little doubt that as children mature, their conception of words change. In addition, according to Brown (1958), the sequence of word acquisition is highly dependent upon the categorizations or labels verbalized by adults. Children's vocabulary then, may reflect a movement toward higher abstraction and/or greater concreteness depending upon their vocabulary environment. Therefore, Brown concludes that language development does not necessarily proceed from concrete to abstract. Meanings then, could exhibit a diversity and range of combined abstractness and concreteness. Consequently, the researcher hypothesized that for this study a combination of descriptors would be utilized for classifying the children's verbalizations representing the cognitive process meaning association reflective of the child's combined use of multivariate modes of representation.

For this study, the researcher adapted Siemen's (1973) approach in examining a child's word meaning to include whatever verbalized portion carried the meaning that is, a single word, a phrase, a single sentence, or an elaboration as an ideational unit of verbalized word meaning. In addition, the researcher observed and noted non-verbal language as a factor in the analysis of the children's verbalized ideational units. According to Seiler & Wannenmacher (1983)

> an investigator who considers observable action which includes verbal communication and bases his interpretation on the subject's expressed views of the situation will have a much better chance of determining the extent to which the subject is acting (or able to act) on a representational level . . . The researcher will often look for mixed procedures that include non-verbal elements and aspects (p. 329).

In this study because the researcher utilized both audio and videotaping of play episodes, verbalizations were the prime source of data and non-verbal cues were utilized in concert when they reflected a corroborative accurate assessment of verbalization.

Research conducted at the University of Alberta has resulted in the development of a classification for verbalized word meanings. Lim-Alparaque (1983) tabulated data according to the following features:

1. descriptive
2. functional
3. exemplar
4. synonym
5. antonym
6. circular

These descriptors are defined in Appendix A and will be utilized in conjunction with the descriptors outlined in the literature.

SUMMARY

In reviewing the related literature and research, the theoretical background related to play was discussed because play was the medium through which the data was collected. The literature suggested that play was the prime motivator from whence the children's activities evolved. It was considered the avenue for the children to investigate their world while furthering their interest and concentration as they experienced a greater degree of cognitive awareness of their environment. However, it is through the interactive process of sociodramatic play that children

learn to organize their thinking. In this context, language becomes a tool for the children to express their understandings and knowledge of the reading process. Because their assigned task was teaching reading to a stuffed toy, the nature of reading and its associated concepts were discussed. In addition, an explanation for the design of the study based on research was presented. Because of the nature of the study, related literature for establishing classificatory categories and discussion of teaching methods were excluded form the initial related literature until the episodes were read and the protocols partially organized.

CHAPTER III

EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

Within this chapter, the rationale for the design of the study will be discussed first followed by a description of the research instrument, the play areas, the student sample, and then the two pilot studies. From the analyses of data collected during these pilot studies, categories were identified for use with data analyses in the main study. These categories are identified in this chapter. Finally, the design of the main study including the procedure followed will be set out.

RATIONALE FOR THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY

In developing the design, the points-of-view of several researchers were considered as reported in Chapter II. Initially, the use of previous research techniques to ascertain the level of child awareness and knowledge of reading processes and strategies were considered to be inadequate because they often created confusion of thought--confusion brought about by either misinterpretation of the research question by children in a study or an incorrectly posed probe. However, the researcher was aware that while the methodology utilized in this study could reveal gaps in the present store of knowledge it could also simultaneously not divulge what the children in this study knew--simply because the particular play sessions might not reveal that knowledge.

THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

Two comparable narratives in a regular reader context, one for each school, were selected as the research instrument (Appendix C). Essentially, the teachers chose the narratives to be utilized by the students because the researcher deemed this procedure to be a practical solution to obtaining class sets of books other than those in use in the classroom. In addition, the classroom teachers had the advantage of knowing the appropriateness of the story for her particular students and the follow-up activities required. However, the researcher had previously suggested to the teachers that an animal story be chosen and they agreed. The researcher confirmed their choices because they met the following criteria identified by the researcher before contacting the teachers:

1. The narratives were to be equal in length that is, approximately 300 to 400 words.
2. Both stories were to be at the Grade one reading difficulty level according to Fry's Readability Graph.
3. Animals were to be the main characters.
4. Each narrative was to reflect the characters acting in a setting familiar to the children.
5. Both stories were to be fanciful.

The following table indicates the level of difficulty of the narratives according to Fry's Readability Graph.

Table 3.1

Readability of Reading Selections According to Fry

Reading Selections	Length of Sentences in Words	X	Number of Syllables	X	Level of Readability
Gardens By The Brook					
Beginning Portion	15		108		Grade One
Middle Portion	15	16.6	120	116.6	
End Portion	20	(av.)	122	(av.)	
Peter and the Goats					
Beginning Portion	11		118		Grade One
Middle Portion	11	10.6	117	117	
End Portion	10	(av.)	118	(av.)	

The narratives chosen by both teachers met the criteria accordingly:

1. "Gardens by the Brook" was 408 words in length. "Peter and the Goats" was 334 words in length.
2. Both stories were at the Grade one reading difficulty level according to Fry's Readability Graph (see Table 3.1).
3. Animals were the main characters; however, "Peter and the Goats" had a young boy as well for a main character.
4. Each narrative reflected the characters in a setting familiar to the children; one story was of gardening, the other of herding animals.
5. Both stories were fanciful. In "Gardens by the Brook," Mrs. Bear carried out her own idea of planting flowers in spite of the advice

from friends. Bees came to her rescue and made honey. In "Peter and the Goats" after many animals attempted to chase the goats out of the turnip field, the smallest animal, the bumblebees successfully completed the chore much to the consternation of the others.

It was noted that one group of two students brought in to their main study play period a small pocket book entitled "Garfield" which was utilized in their performance. In another instance, a group chose to employ their professional decision-making abilities and decided to read a variety of stories from the reader in which "Peter and the Goats" appeared. The problem associated with groups choosing stories other than the initially selected story was not evident in one school because students were presented with a photocopy of the story as was the practice in the classroom. However, as it was mentioned earlier, it was impossible for the researcher to know what story or procedure the children undertook because she had absented herself from the play area. The choice of a variety of narratives though should have no major effect on the results of the study as the researcher hypothesized that processes and strategies utilized in reading a narrative should remain constant over time. For example, research has reported that students intuitively applied the elements of story structure as they both heard and read stories (Holdaway, 1979). They would know that a narrative follows a pattern whereby characters and setting are introduced followed by some action and an outcome. In addition, the practice of utilizing different narratives added ecological validity to the study because children could be expected to generalize from one story to another.

"Garfield," the personal book brought in by two students, reflected similar criteria utilized by the researcher to choose stories. Therefore, it was assumed by the researcher that the book was at their reading level and an appropriate choice because "Garfield" is an animal story.

The video and audiotapings were an included part of the research. However, because of technical difficulties and/or handling, not all videotaped performances were available. In addition, each group was provided with a supply of paper and pencils and their use of them has been noted in the performances where these materials were utilized.

THE PLAY AREAS

The play areas utilized for both the pilot and main study were designated rooms outside each regular classroom. Accordingly, the decor was unique in each school. In one school, the room was small and next to a janitor's room and a music room. It housed current professional periodicals and was comfortably furnished with a sofa, table, and chairs. For the play episodes conducted in this area, children sat at a table with both the video and audio equipment present in the room. Because the equipment was moved on a daily basis, no definite pattern of arrangement of equipment was established. However, the children were allowed to position the chairs, table, and E.T.

Contrarily, a larger multi-purpose room was the play area in the other school. For specified days and times the room became the centre for corrective reading. Therefore, one section of the room was partitioned by shelves containing the reading resource materials.

Another area of the room served as a daily lunch room for the children and arrangements of large tables and chairs were evident. In addition, cupboards lined one wall and movable blackboards along another wall shielded extra school equipment. For these play episodes, the children sat at one of the large tables.

STUDENT SAMPLE

Two schools from a county adjoining a large urban centre in Alberta were the source of forty students who comprised the subjects for both pilot study two and the main study. All children in the two classrooms were included in pilot study one. Initially, four students from each school were selected by the researcher to initiate the self-selection procedure which resulted in two groups of two students each (N = four students) for the pilot study and six groups of two students each (N = twelve students) for the main study. From the remaining population, the researcher randomly chose twelve groups of two students each (N = twenty-four students) to complete the sample required for the main study. Neither teachers nor students were informed about the random selection to avoid possible inadvertent biasing of activities of target pupils. All students in both classrooms participated in both pilot studies and the main study but only the data of the chosen forty students were analyzed.

THE PILOT STUDIES AND THE EMERGENT DESIGN OF THE MAIN STUDY

It was hypothesized by the researcher that the methodology would yield data; however, this was an unknown factor until the pilot studies

were undertaken. Therefore, many of the procedures for both the pilot and main studies appear to be intertwined. This was necessitated because of the need to both confirm that data were forthcoming and also to secure data for the main study as the school term was drawing to a close. There were two pilot studies and a main study (see Table 3.2). Pilot study one was completed in three stages--stage one was an orientation period conducted in each respective classroom and stage two, an organization and preparation period in both the classrooms and the designated play areas. The third stage was the actual teaching of E.T. how to learn art, mathematics, printing, and rules in two practice sessions conducted in the play area. The second pilot study constituted the actual teaching of reading to E.T. by two groups of two students each in two teaching sessions, one ten minutes and the other thirteen minutes. The main study consisted of two teaching episodes with eighteen groups of two students each. The first episode was ten minutes in length and the second performance was thirteen minutes. Details of both pilot studies and the main study follow.

Stage One of Pilot One

The purpose of the first stage, a three day orientation period, was to orient all fifty-six students to the researcher, to E.T. as a fellow classmate, and to provide an overview for them of the nature of the research. Students were informed by the researcher that they would be audio- and videotaped as they taught E.T. to read. In addition, their verbalizations would appear in a book, the thesis of the researcher. Students were also asked to consider a possible working partner as well

Table 3.2

Student Samples in Pilot and Main Studies

Study	Main Activity	Number of Students School #1	School #2
I Pilot Study One			
A. Stage One	orientation	26	30
B. Stage Two	organization and preparation	26	30
C. Stage Three	two practice runs of five minutes each (teaching art, mathematics, printing and rules to E.T.)	26	30
II Pilot Study Two	teaching reading to E.T. in two teaching episodes (ten minutes and thirteen minutes)	2 (1 group)	2 (1 group)
III Main Study	teaching reading to E.T. in two teaching episodes (ten minutes and thirteen minutes)	18 (9 groups)	18 (9 groups)

as to speculate about probable teaching themes other than reading that would constitute the themes for the two practice teaching sessions of the third stage of this pilot of the study (see Appendices B and C).

Stage Two of Pilot One

The second stage of pilot one was multipronged and undertaken to allow all fifty-six students the opportunity to choose a cohort, suggest and select themes for the two practice sessions of stage three and read the story selected by the teacher in preparation for the teaching runs of the pilot and main studies. These activities were initiated by either the researcher or the teacher.

Stage Two Procedure. (1) During one reading period, a classroom teacher introduced the selected story which was to be utilized in the teaching episodes of both stage three of the pilot study and the main study according to the students' inclinations. Teaching and/or any follow-up activities were initiated following the established practices in the respective classrooms. For example, one teacher photocopied the story for the children to use in the teaching of reading to E.T. The researcher made no attempt to investigate the teacher's methodological approaches to instruction.

(2) The researcher initiated the self-selection of eight groups of two children by first choosing four students in each school (two who scored above the seventy-fifth national percentile on the Canadian Achievement Tests [hereafter designated as N.P. on CATS] and two who scored between the thirtieth and fortieth N.P. on CATS) two for the pilots and six for the main study. The purpose for this procedure was to study the students' choice of partners and their verbalization for further investigation for both the pilot and main studies. After the four students in each classroom identified the classmates with whom they would like to role play, individual students were asked at random by the

researcher to indicate a cohort. A detailed record was kept as to who selected whom (Appendix D). Further description of these student groups has been given in Chapter IV.

(3) The researcher then initiated discussion with the students in each school as to possible themes for the two practice role playing episodes of stage three. The number of student suggestions was limited to twenty, a number arbitrarily chosen by the researcher and considered by her to be adequate because the listing consisted of a wide range of interests and alternatives (Appendix E). At this point the children were divided into groups according to the arranged seating (rows) in evidence in the classroom for selection of two themes from the suggested twenty. The researcher designated one student from each group to be chairperson with the responsibilities of initiating and controlling the discussion in addition to reporting to the entire class after five minutes of discussion the group's choice of two practice role playing themes selected from the twenty class-suggested themes. Both the teacher and the researcher were present in the classroom but assumed no active role. Because of time constraints, the two choices of each group were written on individual slips of paper. These strips with the stated themes were placed into a container and the respective teacher from each school selected two slips at random. Accordingly, the themes for the two five-minute practice role playing episodes in each school were determined for stage three. That is, teaching E.T. school rules, art, mathematics, and printing.

Stage Three of Pilot Study One

The two practice episodes of stage three were undertaken by all students for several reasons:

(1) For the student,

a. As orientation to working in a group of two in the main study.

b. For choosing play clothing if desired.

c. For familiarizing the student to the audio and video equipment.

d. As an orientation to working with E.T.

(2) For the researcher,

a. To examine the group's ability to relate to E.T., a stuffed toy, in the role playing activity.

b. To assess the importance of videotaping as a means of gathering non-verbal cues.

c. To order group appearance to hasten the movement of students to and from the play area during the main study.

The teachers and the principals in each respective school were given a tentative timetable for the main study.

ALTERATION IN PROCEDURE TO PILOT STUDY TWO AND MAIN STUDY

On the basis of the practice episodes in stage three of pilot study one, an alteration was made to the procedure of pilot study two and the main study. As stated earlier, it was found that if the researcher remained in the play area, the children were definitely inhibited in their play performances. In addition, the children questioned the researcher as to what procedures or practices they should employ in the

role playing activity. Therefore, the researcher remained outside of the play area leaving the children entirely on their own during the total performance.

PILOT STUDY TWO

On Thursday, June 7th, one group of two students from one school which was composed of one of the original choices of the researcher and the student's self-selected cohort began the teaching of reading to E.T. in the first of the two episodes. This ten minute performance was audio- and videotaped. After the researcher reviewed this first performance, it was obvious that data were forthcoming and the main study was begun. This same procedure was followed in the second school in the afternoon. The thirteen minute teaching episode of pilot study two was completed within a ten-day period and the data were used to reconfirm the researcher's observations of the first teaching episode.

FIRST TEN MINUTE SESSION OF PILOT STUDY TWO IN SCHOOL ONE

The researcher has stated that after viewing the videotape, it was deemed that knowledge and awareness of reading processes and strategies were definitely being verbalized. Because of the extensiveness of the information available in the pilot study, the researcher believed it was necessary to report only the data reflecting knowledge and awareness of reading processes and strategies. Deleted were student exchanges not focussed on reading; therefore, for this study considered irrelevant.

From the data of pilot study two, criteria for analyzing the verbalization from the main study were abstracted.

The first of the two teaching episodes involved two boys who scored at or above the seventy-fifth N.P. on CATS. Initially, Sharol was selected by the researcher as a subject to investigate his choice of partner and their verbalizations. Sharol chose Karl, whose reading score fell within the same range. A description of this first session follows:

The boys began the first session with the oral reading of the story. However, they did not read it in its entirety but rather stopped the reading as they came to parts which they deemed significant for the play episode with E.T.

E.T. was held on the boys' knees alternately. Karl began by directing E.T.'s attention to the print by focusing on a single word.

Karl: That's the word "there" and that's the word "one."

He continued by asking E.T. for a correct pronunciation.

Karl: Can you say "one"?

At this point, Karl assumed the voice of E.T. and said the word "one." The boys alternated oral reading. As they read, they drew E.T.'s attention to certain aspects of the text including word meanings and pictures.

Karl: Do you know what "sighed" means? It means like he was sort of pouting, okay.

In this instance, Karl attempted to define the term "sighed;" however, it was evident that he had a very vague notion of what the word meant.

Sharol synthesized the story to this point.

Sharol: The goats were in the turnip field and Peter couldn't get them out. That's why he was crying.

Karl and Sharol directed E.T.'s attention to pictures.

Karl: Goats are these, okay, E.T.

Sharol: And this is a rabbit.

Karl: He wants to get them out of the turnip field.

Here the boys collaborated to use concrete examples to portray meaning to E.T. as well as to elaborate on the text.

Sharol: And this is all turnip field right here.

After Sharol had concretely defined turnip field, Karl related background information to fill in the gaps of the text by predicting the consequences of some action.

Karl: If the goats bite off the turnip heads, then the turnips will die, okay, E.T.

Karl related his knowledge of conventions of print as he stated an instructional procedure.

Karl: Okay, on to the next page.

Again, he synthesized the text by relating the following information after directing E.T.'s attention to the picture of the fox.

Karl: Okay, that's the fox and he was trying to get the goats out. And he asked Peter and the rabbit why they were crying, okay. And they were crying because they couldn't get the goats out of the turnip field. That's why the fox is crying XXX.*

---

*unintelligible language on tape

Sharol continued to read. Karl checked for comprehension by asking a higher level "wh" question.

Karl: Do you know why they're crying?

Together the boys replied (collaborative effort):

Sharol and Karl: Because they can't get the goats out of the turnip field, okay.

Karl resumed reading. The following episodic portion reflected the boy's ability to both synthesize information as well as embellish the text.

Sharol and Karl: The rabbit is crying because Peter is crying. The fox is crying because the rabbit's crying. And Peter's crying because all of them can't get the goats out and the bumblebee he came and he said, "Crying doesn't help, okay" [synthesis].

Sharol: The bumblebee got them out by his buzz if the goats don't like the bumblebee's sting. But they don't care if the rabbit comes in or the fox comes in or Peter comes in because if they come in they don't hurt them. But probably a bee's sting probably hurts them. Okay, E.T. [embellishment of text].

The boys completed the oral reading and explaining of the story. Because time remained, they agreed to review the story in the text focussing on the smaller meaning unit, meanings of word.

Karl: Okay, let's go to the first page and let's talk about the first page.

At this point, the boys began to re-read the story and then stopped to elaborate on meanings of words.

Sharol: Okay, Peter had three frisky goats. Frisky means that they're always pretty silly. Yah, they're always crazy.

This definition is very vague; however, the second definition reflects a more precise, accurate meaning.

Sharol: Hillside means like there's a hill and it's the side of the hill.

As the boys continued to re-read the text, the following definition was verbalized reflecting a meaning not consistent with the author's intended meaning. In other words, this suggested that the child was aware of multiple meanings of words but had erroneously applied it in a circular fashion to the author's intended meaning.

Sharol: Drive means like you're in a car and you drive around in a car [Text--"Every night Peter went to get the goats and drive them home."]

The next definition involved both verbal and non-verbal cues and was relatively abstract in that he described the featured target.

Karl: Jumped means like they jumped high [illustrated with hand] like they're on their feet and they just bend their knees and they just go jump.

An example followed of Karl talking his way into a correct meaning with Sharol elaborating that in the story a more complex meaning was intended. The boys' interaction produced a much more precise meaning of the text.

Karl: And turnip means like it's a fruit, no it's a vegetable and . . .

Sharol: It's a turnip field and the field is all covered with turnips and that . . .

Other definitions of selected targets follow:

1. Karl: "Tried" means like if you didn't know, if you tried to make something and you tried some more, okay.

2. Sharol: "Stayed" means like they just kept there and they're standing there eating in the turnip field.

3. Karl and Sharol: "Cry" means that you have a hurt feeling or something and you have little dribbles coming down from your eyes.

Karl now checked E.T.'s ability to enunciate words correctly.

Karl: Could you say "cry?"

Karl [E.T.]: Cry.

4. Sharol: That's good E.T. A rabbit is this [pointed to picture] it has long ears and two buck teeth on the top and they can bite hard. They hop and they run fast. They hop fast. They don't run and do you know what "hop" means? [demonstrated hop with E.T.] Could you say "hop?"

Karl [E.T.] Hop.

5. Karl: Well, a fox is this. It has long ears and a long furry tail. Could you say "fox" E.T.?

Karl [E.T.]: Fox.

Sharol: That's good, E.T. Could you say, Peter?

Karl [E.T.]: Pe--ter.

These final definitions illustrated the boys' collaborating to explain the meanings of the words through the description of attributes

and use of non-verbal cues, in addition to rather vague abstract definitions and a talking through of meaning to derive a more precise definition through supportive dialogue--the dialectic base.

Sharol: Goats are these things. They have horns and that so.

Karl: Sometimes they have little feathers on their chins.

Sharol: Like hair on their chin, like growing a beard.

Before making categorizations, an investigation into a second episode by the same two children will be reported.

SECOND THIRTEEN MINUTE SESSION OF

PILOT STUDY TWO IN SCHOOL ONE

Sharol and Karl repeated their performance within a ten-day period. They utilized the same story "Peter and the Goats" because the researcher hypothesized that a cumulative effect could occur.

Initially the boys began their second episode by oral reading the story again stating "Now we're going to read 'Peter and the Goats.'" Once they had completed the oral presentation, their approach appeared to center on correct pronunciation of words.

Karl: Okay, we'll go back to the front and we'll see if you can say some words, okay? Okay, could you say Peter? Pe--ter?

At this point Karl replied in an assumed voice for E.T. saying "Peter." Sharol and Karl both commended E.T.'s response.

Sharol: Oh, that's good, E.T.

Karl: Yah, good for you.

They utilized non-verbal cues to express their pleasure as they patted E.T. on the head.

The episode proceeded following a similar procedure; although, one change occurred in their enunciation practices. E.T. did not respond; however, the boys continued to commend E.T.'s unstated response. Essentially, this episode was similar to the first episode in that they defined words, some of the same words, in addition to elaborating on the text.

Karl: Now hillside means like its a hill and uh and they're on the side and three frisky goats--Peter had three frisky goats. Frisky means that the did a lot of mischief and all that, okay.

The first definition represented a clear idea of what a hillside is; however, the second definition was significant in that the child had demonstrated from one reading to the next that he now had a clearer although rather vague interpretation of the meaning of the word "frisky." Recall in the first episode he referred to frisky "as sort of pouting." In the next episodic portion, Karl and Sharol collaboratively attempted to have E.T. recall certain elements discussed in the first episode.

Karl: Do you know what a rabbit is? Good for you E.T.

Sharol: How about "He ran into the turnip field." Remember.

Karl: What did he do then? He went in the XXX. Right.

Karl: Okay, let's start with "cry." Do you know what "cry" means? No. Oh. "Cry" means like like there's little water things XXX remember on last day.

Sharol elaborated: Your eyes get water and then you start to cry.

Karl added further: like if you break something and you get into trouble.

Sharol: And then you start to cry and you get a spanking sometime and it hurts and you start to cry.

The boys embellish to a greater degree using more background information to convey meaning. Continuing with word meanings; however, the next term was different from those in the first episode.

Karl: I run very fast [quote from text]. Do you know what run means? You do?

Demonstrating with his fingers moving rapidly across the table, Sharol stated:

Sharol: You just go like that except you do it with your feet.

Karl: Let's see you run.

Sharol helped E.T. demonstrate running.

In this episodic portion, the boys demonstrated their ability to work cooperatively utilizing both verbal and non-verbal cues to generate a meaningful definition.

As the performance continued, their procedure altered slightly. The boys attempted to have E.T. recall information from the previous episode on a verbal level using the picture to clarify the content of their questioning.

Karl: Do you know what a goat is?

Sharol: Yah, you know what is a goat.

Karl: Yah, we told you last day. Yah you know.

Sharol: Yah, for sure. What is it? [no response]

[Held the book up for E.T. and demonstrated from the picture appearing in the text.]

As the episode continued, the boys combined their efforts to generate and clarify a meaning--an embellishment of a term defined in the first episode.

Karl: Okay, you know what a fox is? No?

Sharol: Like it's a big animal that has a furry, furry tail and it has pointed ears and it's really bad.

Karl: He eats people.

Sharol corrected Karl's response.

Sharol: No, not people, animals.

Karl: Yah, animals. That's cruel. He might even eat you.

Sharol quickly disqualified this last statement empathizing with E.T.

Sharol: No, you're strong.

That pictures were a significant feature of the boy's instruction was demonstrated by the following verbalizations which reflected a synthesis of text information and a concrete defining of terms.

Sharol: Look it, here's the rabbit. Now look at the goats up there. He's running to get the goats.

Sharol: There's a fox. There's a fox. He might eat the goats. See the rabbit crying. Tears, those are crying [pointed to text].

Sharol: Now, they're all crying. See, the bee comes along and tells them to stop crying 'cause he thinks it's foolish to cry so he tells them to stop crying. They stop crying and they make fun of him. Ah, you can't get him out because

we couldn't. We tried to and we can't. And he went buzzing in the turnip field.

In addition, pictures were utilized by the boys as they collaboratively used verbal and non-verbal cues to demonstrate the meaning of the word "buzz."

Karl: Buzz, buzz, buzz. Do you know what buzz means?

Sharol: Buzz, when the bumblebee goes, he goes bzz [demonstrated flying of the bee with his hand]. When it's flying it makes that buzz sound.

Also, Sharol verbalized a description of some attributes of the bumblebee.

Sharol: And the little bumblebee scared the goats. Yah! And the goats were scared. How can the bumblebee scare the goats? It's so small. Right. [no response from E.T.]

The performance concluded with a rehashing of the importance of the turnip leaves to the turnip.

From this first session of Pilot Study Two in School One, the researcher abstracted the following criteria to be utilized in categorizing the data for the main study.

I Student Knowledge and Awareness of Conventions of Print

A. reference to letters, words, sentences, and pages

II Student Knowledge and Awareness of Reading Processes

A. attending to text

B. associating sound to letters

C. associating meaning to words

D. synthesizing of text information

E. predicting

III Student Knowledge and Awareness of Reading Strategies

A. for comprehension

1. using "wh" questions

2. using pictures to understand words and ideas

B. for correcting misconceptions (monitoring)

IV Student knowledge and Awareness of:

A. oral mode of reading

1. words

2. text

From the second session data in school one, several elaborations of the criteria abstracted from the first session were noted. Word meanings were more elaborate and new definitions were included. The boys used pictures appearing in the story to clarify meanings of words and for synthesizing text information to that point in the narrative.

FIRST TEN MINUTE SESSION OF PILOT STUDY TWO IN SCHOOL TWO

Two little girls, Louise and Tamara, were the subjects in the second pilot conducted in the afternoon at School Two. Louise was one of the performers chosen by the researcher to investigate her choice of partner and their verbalization. However, Louise who scored between the fortieth and fiftieth N.P. of CATS selected Tamara whose score fell well below this level. For their performance they utilized a photocopy of the narrative as was the common practice in the classroom.

The episode began with procedural matters followed by the alternate oral reading of the narrative "Gardens by the Brook."

Louise: Okay, Tamara will read the first paragraph to you and then we'll see if you can figure out some of the words.

After completing the paragraph, Louise simultaneously directed E.T.'s attention to and the sequence of print by pointing to the individual words with a pencil.

Louise: I'm going to ask you some words. Now what's this word?

In addition, Tamara drew E.T.'s attention to the title.

Tamara: And what does the title say?

Tamara [E.T.]: Gardens by the Book.

Louise corrected E.T. simply by stating the word "brook" thereby achieving word identification through an external regulator. The episode continued with Louise circling and pointing to the words. When E.T. fell over, Louise straightened him and stated:

Louise: E.T. you gotta watch.

Therefore, she stressed the importance of attending to print. In addition, the following procedure was utilized to aid E.T. to attend to what appeared exactly in the text.

Tamara: Okay, E.T. Let's see Tamara is going to read. If she makes a mistake when she is reading, you have to circle the word.

At this point, a pencil was placed in E.T.'s hand. The episode continued with the incorrect words being circled. When E.T. fell over again, he was reminded about attending to the text.

Louise: E.T. you watch. Keep your eyes on your work.

SECOND THIRTEEN MINUTE SESSION OF PILOT STUDY TWO

IN SCHOOL TWO

The second episode undertaken within ten days began again with procedural matters taking precedence.

Tamara: Okay, E.T. You sit up. Now you're going to say all the names of the people in the story.

Louise: I want to read about four pages, okay. [directs E.T.'s hand to print.] Let's ask him some questions. Okay, E.T., uh, would you like to go first?

Tamara: Okay, E.T. How many people are there in this story?

As E.T. stated the names of the characters, the girls circled them in the story. Essentially the girls devised a plan of action and proceeded according to the arrangement.

The episode continued with Tamara reading four pages.

Tamara: Um, E.T. Let's see. What are the people doing?

Louise restated the question.

Louise: like, what are they going to do?

Tamara: Yah, summer, winter, winter, summer, winter anything what.

It would appear that some confusion had arisen re: the question but later in the episode Tamara stated:

Tamara: They planted food, then they store it for the winter.

This statement signified Tamara's ability to elaborate on the text filling in gaps from her own experiences.

The next significant episodic portion was stated by Louise.

Louise: E.T. we would like to you tell us what the story was about.

Here she was checking for comprehension however, E.T.'s response "plants in a garden" indicated that he had developed a concept of only part of the main idea of the story.

From the two teaching episodes of Pilot Study Two in School Two very different information was revealed. The following criteria were abstracted from the first teaching episode to be utilized for categorizing the data in the main study.

I Student Knowledge and Awareness of Conventions of Print

1. left-to-right progression
2. reference to words, pages
3. reference to book parts such as title

II Student Knowledge and Awareness of Reading Processes

A. attending to text

III Student Knowledge and Awareness of Reading Strategies

A. for word identification

1. asking an external source

B. for comprehension

1. using "wh" questions
2. elements of story structure

a. characters

b. action

c. plot (what the story is about)

IV Student Knowledge and Awareness of:

A. oral mode of reading

1. text

In summary then, the categories unveiled in the two pilot studies by the four students follow:

I Student Knowledge and Awareness of Conventions of Print

A. left-to-right progression

B. reference to book parts such as titles

C. reference to words, pages, letters, and sentences

II Student Knowledge and Awareness of Reading Processes

A. attending to text

B. synthesizing of text information

C. associating sound to letters

D. associating meaning to words

E. predicting

III Student Knowledge and Awareness of Reading Strategies

A. for word identification

1. asking an external source

B. for comprehension

1. using "wh" questions

2. using pictures and words to understand words and ideas

3. elements of story structure

a. characters

b. action

c. plot (what the story is about)

C. for correcting misconceptions (monitoring)

IV Student Knowledge and Awareness of:

A. oral mode of reading

1. words

2. text

THE MAIN STUDY

As it has been stated, after the initial viewing of the data from the first teaching episode of pilot study two the researcher decided to initiate the main study at 0930 and 1315 hours, audio and videotaping for the entire morning and afternoon in alternate schools. However, the four individuals who were initially selected by the researcher for the two teaching sessions of pilot study two were audio and videotaped between specified hours. Changes were made to the play sessions of the main study to accommodate students who were involved in outdoor physical education classes thereby disrupting the ordering of groups. In addition, each performance of the second episode of the main study was extended by approximately three minutes to thirteen minutes because some students maintained that the time allotment for the first episode was too brief in that they had not completed their assigned task.

The procedure utilized in the main study follows:

1. A group of two children were taken from the classroom to the play area by the researcher.
2. The equipment was checked and the researcher withdrew from the play area.

3. After the designated ten minute performance was completed, the children were returned to the classroom.
4. Within a ten day period, the same groupings repeated the teaching of reading to E.T. in a thirteen minute episode.
5. Protocols were typed from audio taped episodes with the viewing of the available videotapes realizing additional information and reconfirming the audiotaped data.
6. The data were then categorized according to the criteria identified in the pilot studies. Some criteria were elaborated and others added.

SUMMARY

The design of the study was essentially descriptive and the focus was on the knowledge and awareness of reading processes and strategies as revealed in a play group setting by groups of two children each teaching E.T. how to read. Opportunity was provided for two pilot studies which oriented, prepared, and provided students with practice for the main study. From an examination of the pilot study data, the main study design was refined, categories to be used in data analyses were identified and more precise definition was given to these categories.

CHAPTER IV

THE RESULTS OF THE DATA ANALYSES: FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

This chapter reports findings in three parts. In Part One, the sample of children and their reactions to taping, both audio and video and to E.T. are reported. A description of role playing activity by students will complete Part One.

In Part Two, the children's verbalizations about reading are described in abbreviated form by each of the eighteen student groups using categories noted in Chapter III. Of these four catagories three of them are refined and amplified. Then in Part Three, a further synthesis of findings by each category or portions thereof by the total sample of thirty-six students is given. Where warranted, some discussion is included.

PART ONE

STUDENT SAMPLE

The sample of forty children was selected to obtain a representative group of children reflecting a fairly stable mixed rural and urban population as designated by Central Office Personnel of the county.

The students were

1. Residents of a community considered to be representative of middle socio-economic status;
2. Currently in the second grade of school;
3. Considered to be average language users by their teachers;
4. Drawn from two schools with unequal male/female population;
5. All asked to participate in the entire project.

Initially four students from each school were chosen to begin the self-selecting procedure to form groups of two, one for the pilot studies and three for the main studies. This was done in order that the researcher could subject their choice of cohort and performance to a closer scrutiny. After one student in each school selected her partner for the pilot studies, groups were formed by the children in the classrooms to include from each school the three students and their partners initially selected for the main study and then six groups chosen at random. These groups reflected a wide range of possible groupings of N.P.'s. A record was kept of groupings according to N.P. and is reported with each episode.

Partners in groups were generally of the same sex; however, there were two instance of a mixed group (male/female). Table 4.1 summarizes the composition of groups.

CHILDREN'S REACTIONS TO VIDEO AND AUDIOTAPING AND E.T.

In this study, both audio- and videotaping were undertaken because it was found during the pilot study that children did not always verbalize obvious literacy skills. For example, a child would pick up E.T.'s

Table 4.1

Student Sample

	Number of Groups of Two Students	Groups of Two Girls	Groups of Two Boys	Mixed Groups	Number of Students
I Pilot Study					
One	1		1		2
Two	1	1			2
II Main Study	18	9	7	2	36
Total					40

"hand" demonstrating left-to-right progression. In addition, children utilized non-verbal as well as verbal cues when they expressed word meanings. However, the videotaping presented a problem in that the children would perform for the monitor. Despite the opportunity to participate in two practice role playing activities prior to the main study, behavior which detracted from their assigned activity of teaching E.T. to read occasionally appeared to a greater or lesser extent depending upon the students. For example, they would make faces, poke one another, or make the "peace sign" behind another student's head. Essentially, though the periodic time-off task behaviors were relatively short-lived as the students resumed the performance almost as if these interludes had not occurred. These behaviors may have been corrected if the researcher had remained in the play area; however, as stated earlier during the pilot studies it was found that the students asked procedural

questions of the researcher in addition to appearing to be more inhibited in the role playing activity.

The audiotaping posed less of an intrusion into the actual performance. For the main, all students ignored the microphone which was placed on the table. However, there were instances when the children picked up the microphone either to discuss it or speak and/or sing directly into the mechanism. For example, the following statement occurred while Brenda held the microphone:

> Brenda: This is a kind of microphone that people use when they're singing. I wonder if it's on or off. It's on. It's on. [Group 6.]

The microphone was replaced on the table and the episode resumed as if there had been no interruption. However, Jane and Krystal (Group 2) utilized the microphone throughout both episodes speaking directly into it at all times.

Generally, the participants in the groups actively involved the puppet, E.T. in all proceedings. He was sometimes held on a child's knee, positioned on the table, or placed on a chair. For example,

> Junella: I start this time, Brenda and I'm going to write your name. You can hold him while I'm doing it and then I get to hold him while you're doing it [Group 6].

In addition, E.T. was treated with a great deal of warmth.

> David: E.T., my little E.T., keep looking through my books [Group 11].

He was also the source of comparative discussion as indicated by the verbalization of Chester and Darwin [Group 18].

Chester: He's bigger than the one I got.

Darwin: He's bigger than mine. Mine's only about that size.

Chester: Yah, he's fatter too.

Darwin: He's fat and look at his feet--big.

Essentially, the children were very receptive to E.T., the puppet.

DESCRIPTION OF ROLE PLAYING ACTIVITY

Cohen & Stern (1978) outlined in question form aspects of child behavior and interaction which would be evident in children's dramatic play. The following two questions provided a framework for the description.

1. What roles does the child take in dramatic play?

The children assumed a variety of roles. Sometimes both children were teachers. On other occasions one individual would slip from one role to another without any apparent cue from her cohort. Occasionally, one child assumed the role of teacher, the other the role of E.T. alternately. The procedure followed was generally agreed upon through an on-going consensus of the two children.

Another approach revealed in the role playing performances demonstrated one child's acceptance of both roles, E.T. and the teacher. By altering her voice the child demonstrated her ability to undertake the two roles. However, sometimes it appeared the roles were agreed upon prior to the performance and/or it was assumed shared knowledge as to who would play which role. Very little disagreement was in evidence as to

who would accept which role or roles. In this study, very few children chose to dress in costume despite the availability of alternate play clothing.

2. In playing roles, what position does the child take in relation to others?

Mainly, both children were involved in equal role playing time. However, instances of one participant being completely overshadowed by another were also evident on at least one occasion. Generally, however the children mutually agreed through gesture, whispered conferencing or stating emphatically, "Hey it's my turn" as to the position each child assumed.

PART TWO

DESCRIPTION OF STUDENT VERBALIZATIONS ABOUT READING BY GROUPS OF TWO STUDENTS

Following is a descriptive analysis of student behaviors in eighteen group performances. Each group performance is condensed and the categories of behavior that emerged compared with those identified in Chapter III. A complete rendition of the performances of two groups, Groups 4, and 7, appears in Appendix F.

At this time, it is observed that the subcategory "attending to text" reflects a situation in which some children focussed E.T.'s attention on a specific number of words whereas, others involved E.T. attending to a page of text on which there were many words.

COMPILATION OF EPISODES

Group 1: Andrew (N.P. 84) chose Sonny (N.P. 40)

This episode represented the performance of two boys whose scores on CATS reflected both ends of the continuum. Andrew whose score was at the upper limits picked Sonny who scored at the fortieth percentile.

The boys began the episode by mutually agreeing that Andrew would start the oral reading of "Peter and the Goats." After reading the first page, Andrew focussed E.T.'s attention to the picture in the text.

Andrew: See. See. XXX Every night Peter went to get the goats and drive them home.

Sonny had more difficulty with oral reading; therefore, Andrew often corrected his miscues. However, Andrew did not allow the performance to move smoothly as he persistently giggled until Sonny admonished his behavior. One incident though, reflected an attempt at meaning. While Andrew was reading "Peter is crying," Sonny took E.T.'s hand, rubbed E.T.'s eyes and verbalized "Wah, wah," a crying noise. After completing the initial reading, Sonny made reference to the term, "page."

Sonny: That's the end. There's more time. Turn to page 59.

Andrew: What's on page 59?

In both episodes they either alternately or simultaneously read the story of "Peter and the Goats" orally several times. However, there were occasions when they appeared to be oblivious of each other's activities. Despite the similarity of performances for both episodes, differences did occur. In the second episode, Sonny directed E.T.'s attention to print demonstrating left-to-right progression with E.T.'s hand.

In summary then, the boys made reference to the term "page" twice, demonstrated left-to-right progression while attending to the text, utilized a picture to exemplify the meaning of the text, and associated meaning of a word through gesture.

Group 2: Krystal (N.P. 42) chose Jane (N.P. 34)

The next episode represented two girls who reflected the lower end of possible scores on CATS. Krystal was selected by the researcher prior to the pilot studies to investigate her choice of cohort (N.P.) and analyze their verbalizations for differences of approach or content in their performances.

Krystal and Jane began oral reading to E.T. and then decided to put on alternate clothing which was available. Taking turns with the oral reading of "Peter and the Goats," the girls concluded this portion by indicating their approval of E.T.'s performance.

Jane: Good E.T. that was really good. I'm proud of you.

Jane continued stressing the importance of practicing and receiving help from an external source such as parents.

Jane: But you'll have to practice and practice, you know that. Yah!

Krystal [E.T.]: Really, Oh.

Jane: So, E.T., you better learn reading with your Mom and Dad.

She also suggested the importance of focussing on print followed by some general rules for correct reading posture.

Jane: You better start fixing up the arms of them to write with and read because you'll have to move them to where your spot is and that's how we read that story.

Jane: You have to practice to read that story. Okay, that's why you should put . . . put some hands on your book and feet on the ground and sitting up straight 'cause you'll just go like this . . .like this, I'll show you.

She demonstrated through the oral reading of a portion of the passage, the importance of posture to correct enunciating.

Jane: See, you can't pick up your voice if you go, ooo your voice isn't coming out so you'll have to have your voice coming out so you can hear the people.

In addition, Jane was aware that reading was important and that a reader must know certain rules as well as knowing problems associated with reading.

Jane: Reading is important. It's really good for you, you know that . . . know your reading problems and everything and ask the teacher.

Because Jane failed to state specific reading problems, the researcher can only assume what the child meant and the nature of the problem. However, the following verbalizations suggested that rules were associated with questions as Jane asked E.T. a "wh" question.

Jane: Okay, so now back to some reading rules. That bee, why did the bee get the goats out, why E.T.?

Jane [E.T.]: Because a bee has a stinger, bzz!

At this point Krystal entered into the episode relating her concept of reading.

Krystal: Well, E.T., about reading, you have to know about words. If you don't know a word, well sound it out. If it's like because you'll have to know that it's very hard to understand it and spell it.

She demonstrated that she was cognizant that certain words in English are difficult to associate symbol with sound and therefore, present some difficulty for spelling because the orthographic structure does not reflect regular sound/letter correspondence.

In addition, in the second episode she verbalized her knowledge of books when she discussed the contents [table of contents].

Krystal: Yah! . . . even the contents. But the contents. They have nice stories like The Little Red Riding . . .

Here, she corrected herself and continued.

Krystal: Hen and the Fox. They have really good stories. I want to find "Little Red Hen and the Fox" now.

Using the table of contents, the children found the story and related information about it through observation of a picture.

Krystal: The fox was so bad they wanted to try to eat him, the Little Red Hen so she has a little pocket well they call it an apron. Well, she has scissors. Everything she cut it out, cut herself out. She was saved and the fox he thought XXX.

One of the major concerns voiced by these children was whether E.T. would pass. This appears to suggest that this concern was probably

reflecting their own uncertainty. They concluded the episode by printing out words and letters for E.T. to enunciate thereby drawing E.T.'s attention to print.

Krystal: Jane will print some words to E.T. and he'll try to say them out. Jane will print them nice so that E.T. can read them.

Krystal then stated the reason why the procedures followed throughout the performances was necessary.

Krystal: E.T. came from a different planet. He didn't know how to talk or read so that's why we teachers help E.T.

Group 3: Ann (N.P. 78) chose Nicole (N.P. 87)

The next episode represented two little girls' attempt to teach E.T. how to read. Ann, whose ability according to the results on CATS was above the seventy-fifth percentile selected a cohort, Nicole, of similar standing.

Initially, the researcher would like to comment on their approach to each episode. Although the practice performances were not considered to be significant to the main study, it was apparent that the girls utilized the knowledge related to E.T. in the printing session as an introduction to the main study. This information suggested that they were aware of the significance of discriminating letters and applying the correct sound correspondence.

Nicole: Today, we're going to teach you how to read. As you know on Tuesday we came here and taught you how to print all

the letters down. Now today we're going to teach you how to read a story. Can you tell what this letter says?

Ann: Ā.

Nicole: But what's the noise of it?

Ann: Ă.

Here the girls directed E.T.'s attention to print and simultaneously focussed on associating letters and sound. Ann speaking in a normal voice answered for E.T.

Episode two reflected a similar attempt to tie the two reading episodes together.

Nicole: Do you remember us, E.T., Ann and Nicole? Which one's Ann and which one's Nicole? Okay, do you remember how to read?

Ann assumed the role of E.T. replying: sort of.

Nicole: Let's see you read the first two pages.

Nicole now assumed the role of E.T. and began to read with an appropriate E.T. voice. Quickly, however, she reverted to the role of instructor.

Nicole: No, read the title first.

Ann [E.T.]: Where's the title?

Nicole: Title is the thing in big letters.

It is evident from this episodic portion that the girls have related the instructional session with the previous one by reviewing information discussed. Indicative of this statement was the following example, in the first episode where the title appeared to have significance as Nicole corrected Ann when she omitted reading it.

Nicole: Do you know what she forgot?

Ann: Yah, I know.

Nicole: The title.

Later, in this episode Ann again reminded E.T. to read the title.

Ann: Remember to read the title "Otherwise."

In addition, reference was made to the terms "page" eight times; and "word," "sentence," and "paragraph" once.

Ann: Okay, now you try and read that page.

Nicole: No, he'll read the last two pages.

Ann: but, he'll forget most of the words.

Ann: You read the first two sentences and I'll read the last two.

E.T. was reminded of the importance of attending both verbally and non-verbally.

Nicole: Are you listening?

Non-verbally, the girls utilized E.T.'s hand to indicate left-to-right progression.

Several attempts to question E.T. using a "wh" question were in evidence. For example,

Ann: Where's the title?

Ann: E.T. do you know what the rabbit is doing?

Nicole: E.T. can you tell us what the story is about so far?

Nicole: What kind of hen? What color was she?

In addition, Nicole stated an inference question.

Nicole: Do you think she'll do it all over again?

It was noted that some children felt the episodes were too lengthy. For example, this verbiage appeared at the end of the second episode.

Ann: Well, I wish we could go now. If only Louise would come soon.

Nicole: Well, life is life. You can't go now because Louise didn't pick us up.

This performance did last for approximately thirteen minutes.

Group 4: Samuel (N.P. 81) chose Ralph (N.P. 34)

For the first performance, Ralph and Samuel used external materials, that is, a narrative other than that originally intended for the episode, "Garfield." However, despite the differences in stories, definite literacy skills were unveiled consistently throughout the two stories—"Garfield" in the first episode and "Peter and the Goats" in the second episode.

Generally, the boys whose reading performance according to the results on CATS mirrored both ends of the continuum, focussed their teaching procedures on elements of intrinsic phonics as the words were abstracted from the contextual situation in which they occurred. They began the episode by studying individual words in a sentence, initially spelling the word.

Ralph: You know what that says?

Samuel [assumed E.T. voice]: No.

Ralph: "O" and "n" makes "on," okay.

However, Samuel immediately associated the correct sound correspondence for each of the symbols.

Samuel: Okay, listen, E.T., here. This is "o" makes the o [ah] sound and then but sometimes "o" can be o sound too. And the "n" just makes the "nnn" sound.

In addition, he suggested a distinction between word and letter.

Samuel: And there's no such word as "n."

The next episodic portion suggested a slight variation in the boys' approach to word identification. Initially the boys focussed on the whole word and then analyzed the parts by associating letters and sound.

Ralph: Okay, E.T., this is "the."

Samuel: The.

Ralph: "T-H" together sound like this [makes the "th" sound], "e" is just "ah."

In addition, the boys attempted to generalize a specific phonics rule.

Ralph: and sometimes it can say e too. But you need a magic e at the end of the "a" after it . . . or something like that.

Samuel: And then it would sound like a.

The boys then returned the words to the contextual situation in which they appeared.

Ralph: You know what the next word is, "way."

Samuel: Like this, "On the way," and then this is a "to." "On the way to his nap." I'm just going to read the whole sentence. Okay, you see that? That's "On the way to his nap the other day."

At this point, Samuel drew E.T.'s attention to the names of two of the characters.

Samuel: Oh, Garfield's the name of the cat. Poukee's the name of the teddy bear.

The boys combined their efforts to relate the significance of attending to the text through print and pictures.

Samuel: You can look at the pictures, too. You see that's Garfield in the sun sleeping.

Ralph: Let him see the words, too.

Additional attention was focused on the correct enunciation of Garfield.

Ralph: Garfield—Gaar-field. Garfield. Okay.

The boys continued to either read simultaneously or individually drawing E.T.'s attention to different sight words.

Ralph: When you're finished just go over it slowly and show him the different words. Okay. That's "I" and that's "love" and that's "sunbeam."

Samuel: And that's "you."

Ralph: See that one. That's Garfield saying "Drats."

In addition, reference was made to the term "page" three times. For example,

Samuel: Now, this page and this page.

Throughout the episode the boys either assumed the role of teacher or E.T. Essentially they were aware of the fact that "Garfield" was not the text to be utilized in their performance but it was their preference.

Ralph: You like this story better than the one those other people were teaching you.

Samuel: Yah.

The second episode began with the boys focussing E.T.'s attention on the text.

Ralph: E.T., you look over here. I said, look. Not that closely. Not on the book. "Peter." Can you hold on to him? He doesn't want to sit up.

At this point Ralph analyzed the word Peter as he spelled it.

Ralph: Peter, see that "e" it say Pe. . . . See that "e." Do you know why it's an "e" because there's an "e" there.

Ralph demonstrated his knowledge of associating sound to letters in addition to his ability to apply a phonics rule, [silent e].

Samuel assumed the role of E.T. and began to read; Ralph corrected his miscues. For example:

Samuel [E.T.]: A goat didn't jump.

Ralph: No, the goats jumped into a turnip field.

Ralph continued by focussing E.T.'s attention on the word "the" and then spelling out the word.

Ralph: See, that's "the." T-H-E.

As Samuel (E.T.) continued to read, Ralph corrected miscues.

Samuel [E.T.]: I am crying "bewas."

Ralph: Oh, can you point that out to me. It sounds like bewas.

Ralph at this point drew E.T.'s attention to the orthographic structure of the word by naming the letter which E.T. had confused.

Ralph: It has a "c" in it.

Samuel (E.T.) stated because emphasizing the "k" sound. Samuel now assumed the role of teacher.

Samuel: Okay from now on we're just going to tell E.T. to stop and we're going to ask him to sound out the word, okay!

Ralph repeated this instruction to E.T. on two more occasions. However, Samuel (E.T.) deviated from this procedure as reflected in the following verbiage.

Samuel: Get the goats out of the--out of--out. I said that because it sounded right.

Here it appears that Samuel (E.T.) relied on his knowledge of the language to confirm a word in its contextual situation. However, in the next portion, Ralph corrected Samuel's miscue "grits" by simply stating the word "goats." This procedure was followed by Samuel focussing E.T.'s attention on the parts and correct pronunciation of "beside." That the boys were aware of rules of syllabication was suggested by these statements:

Samuel (E.T.): Bewas to cry.

Ralph: You had the first little bit. You had the ending wrong.

The episode continued with Ralph correcting the miscues acting in the capacity of an external regulator. Finally, the boys completed the performance by reverting to the process of associating sound to letter to identify unknown words. However, a difference occurred in that the boys reviewed words which had been difficult for E.T. by printing them on a piece of paper and having E.T. sound them out.

Ralph: Do you want to review some of these words that you're having trouble with?

Samuel (E.T.): Yah.

Ralph: You tell me the words and I'll sound them out.

The orthographic structure of the words was focussed on as the words were printed.

Ralph: E.T., look over here and see how you spell it. Okay, let's spell it. B-E-G-U-N.

In the process of spelling the words, Samuel verbalized the vowels--"a-e-i-o-u" and attempted a phonics rule.

Samuel: And when there's two vowels together it usually makes its own name.

Group 5: John (N.P. 67) chose Mitchell (N.P. 42)

The next episode represented a performance where one child completely overshadowed the other. They began the episode with an oral reading of "Peter and the Goats" combined with ongoing explanations. The boys' collaborated concept of reading was stated thus:

John: Before you learn to read, you have to learn the word you learn the sound of the letter.

Mitchell interjected: And the words.

John: So what you have to do if you don't know the sound of the letter how you think "P" says. "Pah," "Pah," "Pah." Patiper, Patiper and if you didn't know the word "had" you can say "hid." Peter hid three frisky goats and then say each thing. So if you think "hid" is wrong you know because Peter hid three frisky goats. You would say where he hid three frisky goats. But there is says "each day the goats sleep."

John's concept for reading is added to by Mitchell's interjection. It can be inferred from John's verbalization that he utilized a combination

of processing in that he relied on associating sound to letter to aid his reading as well as utilizing his knowledge of language and the context in which the word appeared to identify and confirm a response (monitoring). However, correct enunciation was also an instructional procedure.

Mitchell: Could you say the words "turnip fields"?

At this point the boys collaboratively defined a jail word as "a word that doesn't sound like it's supposed to, right." As the boys alternated oral reading, they pointed out to E.T. that he may require the use of an external source to identify words if the reading material is too difficult. However, John stated that words can be sounded out. In addition, he indicated that one should read these words with expression and imitate.

Reading appeared to be very important to the boys as they relayed considerable information about the library.

John: Where you get books to read is called a library. Now when you're playing you probably call it library. Whatever. When your turn comes what to look for in the library. You don't look for toys you look for books. And when you are looking for the book you have to look if you want a joke book you look in this listing under jokes and it will tell you where all the jokes are.

Mitchell: And there's a section where you can, where you want to know about dinosaurs look under dinosaur section.

John: And then there's mystery books. There's this book called E.T. and it's really fine but you read about yourself.

Mitchell: You'll learn about yourself.

John: Yes, and when you met Ellie she put you in the closet and you couldn't see, didn't see any books because when you went into the room you could have saw books.

Mitchell: How space ships are made and all that.

John again verbalized the importance of reading with expression. He read rapidly, then both boys pointed out the significance of the period.

John: When you come to a period well it's as big as a dot so what you have to do is . . .

Mitchell interjected: take a break.

John added: Stop and take a little break.

Collectively, the boys demonstrated their knowledge of conventions of print. John applied this knowledge by oral reading a portion of the text in a manner which emphasized the importance of the period.

John: I need a breath so they put a period.

Mitchell finished the episode by stating: If you read too fast, you don't understand the words.

The second episode by Mitchell and John reflected a considerable degree of child involvement with conventions of print. They began their episode with a simple statement of their concept of reading that "what you have to do is say it." As E.T. read, the boys focussed his attention on a jail word, the word "because." They defined a jail word as a "word that doesn't sound as it's said so you'll have to know if it's to say e or a." In addition, John's verbalization suggested that he was aware of the rules of syllabication, one of the more advanced levels of phonic rule application.

John: What you have to do is separate a word. Like this word, be--cause.

As the children focussed E.T.'s attention on the idiosyncracies of words, they displayed a fine sense of humour.

Mitchell: E.T. you made a mistake because this is just one letter. His eyes are pointed the wrong way.

The title appeared to be a significant feature of the story. John made reference to the title "Peter and the Goats" but immediately reminded himself that the title of the book was not read.

John: Now first of all what you have to do in which you forgot, is you forgot to read the title. It's called "Rainbow Letters."

That oral reading was a significant aspect of reading was exemplified by this statement.

John: Now what you forgot to do is that you'll have to say it out loud. And you have to read it with expression.

In several instances the boys demonstrated their awareness of the conventions of print.

1. "This is just one letter."
2. The title of the book and the story.
3. "E.T., you forgot a line."
4. "I went to the next page."
5. "I'll read a sentence, then you read a sentence and then he'll read the next sentence."

Although they did not define these terms such as words, letters, line, sentence, page, and title, they appeared to be aware of the

concepts as indicated by their verbalization in addition to their observed handling facility as viewed on the videotapes. For example,

John: You always start on the next page.

Group 6: Brenda (N.P. 36) chose Junella (N.P. 75)

Brenda and Junella began the episode by focussing E.T.'s attention on a specific page of print.

Junella: Okay, turn to a page and show E.T. where.

Immediately, they eliminated some of the anxiety which may occur in learning to read.

Brenda: I'll help you to read and if you get stuck on a word, then I'll help you with it, okay.

However, Junella did not agree with this approach.

Junella: No, you don't tell him what that word is, you have to tell him how to sound it out.

The girls' approach to teaching word identification reflected both methodologies with a focus on attending to the orthographic structure of words. In addition, the reading process of discriminating was exemplified as Junella brought E.T.'s attention to the shape of an "o."

Junella: Okay, so you'll have to learn how to sound out the words and that funny little shape right there is an "o" and you go "o won," "one" and that says "night" [correct rendition of tape]. That says "on." That says "the."

Brenda however, did not agree with this procedure and made it known to Junella.

Brenda: Yah, but don't say that says "the" and that says "goats" just hurry up.

Junella continued focussing E.T.'s attention on the spelling of words; however, the words were not spelled out letter by letter.

Junella: That's how "jumped" is spelled, that's how "in" is spelled, and that's how "to" is spelled.

Brenda now demonstrated by example how she wanted E.T. to be taught reading.

Brenda: Quickly. Hurry. 'Cause that's all I did because I read really quickly.

Junella finally conceded to teaching according to Brenda's approach; however, she maintained that E.T. must attend to the print.

Junella: But he has to follow along.

At this point according to behavior revealed on the videotape, Junella passed E.T.'s hand under the words exemplifying left-to-right progression as he read the story. This procedure demonstrating progression was followed each time E.T. read. That E.T. experienced difficulty as he read was reflected in this episodic portion.

Brenda: We're trying to teach you how to read.

Junella: He said that he found it hard to talk all the words in this story so we'll help him and so the other children can teach him.

After the story was completed, another one in the text was selected.

Brenda: Let's start another story.

Junella did not agree.

Junella: No, we're not allowed to. Well, it won't matter.

Whereupon Brenda began to read. However, Junella reminded Brenda that she forgot to read the title. That reading the title was significant was also evidenced in the second episode:

Brenda: First always read the story. You have to start with the title. Okay, do you think you can read the title?

It was noted that throughout both episodes, as E.T. read, no verbalization occurred. However, the girls pretended that he did read orally.

Brenda: Come on E.T. Now I'm going to get you to read a page all by yourself this time, okay. [E.T. read silently and Brenda concluded] Right, you remembered that word all along.

The girls made several references to the terms "page" and "word" (twelve times) during their instruction. In addition, they discussed the function of the microphone which was placed on the table.

Brenda: This is the kind of microphone that people use when they're singing. I wonder if it's on or off. It's on. It's on.

As the oral reading progressed, the text was embellished with the girls relating from experience, background information to suggest the meaning of the term "crying."

Junella: You know what? Yesterday, Brenda got her teeth pulled and she didn't cry. Are you going to get some teeth pulled? Are you going to cry?

In another instance as Brenda read "makes fun of the little bee," Junella mimicked taunting laughter, demonstrating the meaning of the term "makes fun."

As the second episode drew to a close, the instructional procedure was altered.

Brenda: Now we do a little bit of printing. You need to know how to print the words.

However, Junella asserted: Well, I'm not going to do printing. I'm going to do numbers. Here's your pen and here's mine. I start this time, Brenda, and I'm going to write your name. You can hold him while I'm doing it and then I get to hold him while you're doing it.

While doing this task, Junella verbalized "E dot T dot" demonstrating her awareness of punctuation required in an abbreviation. The episode closed with E.T. writing numbers which Brenda stated would be used for "Show and Tell" as an example of what E.T. wrote.

Group 7: Mary (N.P. 67) chose Bernice (N.P. 34)

The girls began the first episode with the alternate oral reading of the story focussing their attention on the word within the framework of the sentence.

Mary: Do you know what that word is, it's "this." And if you want to know how to read you have to say the whole sentence. "This is a good day," said Mrs. Bear.

Bernice: Okay, E.T., this is another word you should learn. And this is the word "rabbit" right here. You shouldn't say "Ms." it says, "Mrs. Rabbit."

Mary: Okay, here is a sentence. "I like corn," said Mr. Squirrel. You don't say "Mrs." because then you'll be wrong. You only say "Mr. Squirrel."

Bernice: This word is "dinner" and the other is "cabbage." You don't say "cab." All you say is "cabbage." And the other one is "dinner." You don't say "din."

That the word identified should be meaningful was exemplified in the following episodic portion.

Bernice: And this word is "nothing." You don't just say "noth" or else it doesn't make sense. You just have to add an "ing." It says "nothing."

In addition, as Bernice was discussing the word "cabbage," she verbalized a meaning reflecting a function of "cab."

Bernice: You don't say "cab." That means that it's a cab, like what you ride in.

She also stated a definition reflecting both an attribute and a function of bees.

Bernice: And bees work really hard and cooperate to make the honey for the people.

The second episode did not begin as the first in that the girls did not oral read the story. Instead, they began by focussing E.T.'s attention on identifying specific words.

Bernice: This is a word, "good."

In addition, it was observed on the videotape, that the words were circled in order to place greater attention on each word discussed. After four words were discussed according to sight word methodology, the focus of their instruction was altered to include word meanings. For example,

1. Mary: "Across" means that when you go across something like . . .

   Bernice: A bridge?

   Mary: A bridge, like a bridge, a bridge, a bridge.

   Bernice: Or a mountain [circular].

   Mary: Or a brook.

2. Mary: "Again" means when somebody does it again [circular].

3. Bernice: See the word "brook." Like it's a brook or a pond or something [vague].

4. Bernice: This is the word "honey." It's good for breakfast on your toast [function].

5. Mary: And the next one is "flowers." Flowers smell so good [attribute].

6. Bernice: I've got another word for you. It's in the front page "jump." Like the rabbit jumped up over the bridge [demonstrated with her hand "jumped"] [gesture].

7. Bernice: Okay, now we're going to do the word "corn." Corn is good for you for supper [function].

The following four words all represented meaning denoted through gesture.

8. Bernice: Now we're going to do something else. We're going to do a clap.

Mary: Clap [clapped hands together].

9. Bernice: Snap [snapped fingers].

Mary: Snap [snapped fingers].

10. Bernice: And blink [blinked].

11. Bernice: And we're going to do something else. Okay, E.T. stamp your feet [stamped feet].

It was noted that the girls culminated this activity by slapping and clapping to make a little tune.

12. Bernice: Now the word "sun." Now it means that the sun is bright [attribute].

Mary at this point stated the correct spelling of the term "sun."

Mary: "Sun . . . and it is spelled S-U-N.

The following episode portion represented the girls' collaborated attempt to define the word "love."

13. Bernice: Okay, E.T., now we're going to teach him a little word "love."

[From the videotape it was observed that Bernice clasped her arms across her chest.]

Mary: Love is something when . . .

Bernice: You love each other and you care about each other [synonym].

Mary: Love.

Bernice then spelled the word "love." L-O-V-E. The final definition reflected meaning derived from experience. They began by stating the

function of the word "bike" followed by an explanation of why it was necessary to be cautious when riding. In this explanation, Bernice verbalized a synonym.

Mary: And the next one is "bike." Bike is something that somebody rides.

Bernice: 'Cause if you go into the middle of the road and a car is going, and do you know what happens. The word is "watch out" . . . Okay, E.T., the word is "be--be--be careful" and "watch out."

Throughout the episodes the girls made reference to the term "word" and defined a word by circling or printing it. In addition, they tried to define a sentence by giving an example.

Bernice: Now the word you know. I will teach you a sentence. I will plant some popcorn.

Bernice also made reference to the function of the punctuation, quotation marks; however, the term "quotation marks" was not stated.

Bernice: Now, we're going to have to do something else. See it's like a--it's like a--it's like a sentence. See somebody's talking. See. "I will plant some cabbage."

Group 8: Kristopher (N.P. 59) chose Charles (N.P. 73)

Kristopher and Charles began their performance with an oral reading of the story, focusing E.T.'s hand on the print as they read.

Charles: We're going to read you the story and you follow along.

Reading alternately, the boys drew E.T.'s attention to the information available from pictures elaborating on the text. For example,

Charles: See and there he is pointing to the goats because he's sad because he can't get them out.

Kristopher: See, how he can't get the goats out. They're not scared of a rabbit. Oh! Look what's there now.

At this point, Kristopher related the central theme of the story.

Kristopher: There's one thing that is happening in the story. How could he get the goats out of the turnip field? Right, he couldn't.

Their instruction altered as the episode proceeded with the boys focussing E.T.'s attention on the relationship between writing and reading.

Kristopher: Now, Charles will write some words and you're going to have to read them.

Charles: Maybe, I'll write him a sentence. There, now you read that. I'll point to it and you read it.

Observations of the videotape indicated that E.T. attended to each individual word.

The smaller unit of print, the letter, became the focus of the boys' instruction.

Charles: Okay, I'm going to write something else.

Kristopher: What does that letter write?

Charles: It's really an easy letter, an "l."

Kristopher: It's an "r." See there's an "r." This one's an "r." What's that?

Charles: There's a "y." And that's an "r." All you have to do is write a backward "c."

Kristopher: What are you going to write? I'll do a dot-to-dot letter and you tell me what it is. There, what letter is that? Right. Okay, the letter is "A."

Throughout the performances then, the boys made reference to letter, word and sentence.

Group 9: June (N.P. 53) chose Winnifred (N.P. 73)

June's and Winnifred's performance began with an oral reading. As soon as the first reading was completed, the story was re-read.

Winnifred: Let's read the story again.

However, instruction altered as the girls stopped during the oral reading to clarify and define words for E.T.

June read: And drove them home.

Winnifred: So every night Peter drived them home.

June: Yah, not like pick them up in a car and drive them home, just walk them home.

Here, June related a synonym for the word "drive"—"walk," simultaneously indicating that she was aware of the multiple meanings of words.

The girls drew E.T.'s attention to the text as they continued discussing words.

June: Peter had three frisky goats it says. What does "frisky" mean?—Like their hair sticks up, like full of energy.

This definition reflected an abstract verbalization of the term "frisky."

The episode continued with the girls filling in gaps and elaborating on the story where they could.

June: They made fun of the bee.

Winnifred: That wasn't very nice and they saw that bees can get goats out of turnip fields.

In addition to associating meaning to words, the girls verbalized the reading process associating sound to letters.

Winnifred: No, you don't tell him what the word is, you have to tell him how to sound it out.

June: Okay, E.T. What does this say? Never have I taught you to sound it out. Wah-or

Winnifred: Or, or the "o-r" says "or."

June: Or.

Both: Word.

June: Does that sound right? No it doesn't.

June monitored the response and Winnifred confirmed June's stance.

Winnifred: No.

June: So maybe we should say wood.

Winnifred: Let's make it sound like "er." Let's make it sound like an "er."

June: Word.

Winnifred: That sounds like a jail word. That should be if we wanted to, this is a jail word if you wanted that to sound proper, that to sound proper that would be we could have to cross out the "er." We would have to put "er" instead of "or."

June: So that says "word." You try spelling the word now. Okay, take a hold of the pencil and spell the word. Like I did. Good. You spelled word, okay.

As the story was being re-read for the third time, the children acknowledged the significance of the author's choice of the title. "Peter and the Goats" in that it reflected the main characters of the story. In addition, the verbiage indicated that an awareness existed of who the main and subordinate characters were in the story.

June: That was a good title for it because it was mostly about Peter and the goats not so much the main characters. Peter and the goats were the main characters and not so much the bee or the rabbit or the fox. They weren't there in the whole story. They were there for part of the story, the ending part.

The episode concluded with Winnifred making reference to the term "page."

Winnifred: Let's read the first page and if we have time, we'll read another.

The second episode began similarly to the first in that the girls began with an oral reading of the story. However, E.T. was asked to read as well. In order to eliminate anxiety which may occur as an individual reads, the girls indicated that they would act as external regulators.

June: Now E.T. you try reading the story. We'll help you with a word if you cannot do it.

In addition, as in the initial performance while the story was being read, the girls stopped to discuss after each page, both of them elaborating on the text.

Winnifred: So Peter would took them out every morning and brought them back every night.

June: So he tried to get them out but he couldn't. How come? They stayed there because they liked to--liked, uh, turnips.

That the girls were aware of left-to-right progression was evidenced by the following verbalizations where the girls made reference to the term "page" twice.

Winnifred: Excuse me, but you skipped a page.

June: No, we didn't.

Winnifred: Yah, but you were on this page.

June: Yah, yah we are.

Winnifred: Oh.

In addition, the researcher felt that special attention should be drawn to the mannerliness of the children, typical of most episodes.

Winnifred: Excuse me, but you skipped a page.

Group 10: Elaine (N.P. 26) chose Candice (N.P. 48)

The following episode reflected two little girls' attempts to teach reading according to their interpretation of corrective reading. Candice and Elaine began both episodes with the alternate reading of "Gardens by the Brook." Conferencing was very evident throughout the episodes as the girls decided on procedural matters.

Candice: We're going to be doing some corrective reading. Okay, we're going to be printing if E.T. wants to. We're going to be printing "cabbage" and Elaine is going to write "cabbage."

Elaine: Okay, I'm going to spell the word "cabbage." "K" no "c" [corrected by Candice]. C-A-B-B-A-G-E "cabbage."

Elaine articulated the letters as she printed them on the paper provided. This was followed by the whole word being enunciated suggesting an alphabetic approach to teaching reading stressing visual discrimination of individual letters in addition to focussing on the pronunciation of the whole word.

The episode continued with Elaine delegating the following activity to Candice.

Elaine: Candice is going to spell "Mrs. Bear" for Elaine.

Candice: I am going to be spelling "Mrs. Bear" for Elaine.

Elaine uttered the letters as Candice printed them.

Elaine: M-R-S. B-E-A-R.

Both girls appeared to be aware of the punctuation mark, period, as a necessary element of the abbreviated form as Elaine said the word period while Candice placed it after the word "Mrs." The girls continued with this procedure throughout the episode spelling and printing the following words: "Mrs. Rabbit," "Mr. Fox," and "Mr. Squirrel." However, as Elaine spelled out "Mr. Squirrel," she made reference to "capital S" which was a requirement for the correct spelling of a proper noun.

For both episodes, the girls utilized the same procedure with words from the text, generally the same characters from the story. However, during the second episode E.T. was directly involved with the printing rather than the girls assuming complete control over every aspect. In addition, the researcher noted that they were off task considerably during the second episode as they taught E.T. gym.

Group 11: David (N.P. 44) chose Betty (N.P. 93)

David and Betty, one of the mixed sex groups whose scores on CATS reflected both ends of the continuum, began the two episodes with the oral reading of the story "Gardens by the Brook." For both episodes, the children utilized a question/answer procedure revolving around the idea of spelling the word out on a piece of paper and then directing E.T. to enunciate the word properly. According to David, this procedure exemplified the practice followed during corrective reading.

David: Today, we are going to be doing corrective reading. What is that E.T.?

Betty: That's right, "ducks," you're right.

David: What's that E.T.? How did you know I was spelling sail? E.T., my little E.T., keeps looking through my books.

Betty: What is this word, E.T.? If you said "cabbage," you're not turning green are you? Of course, you're not.

From the above episodic portion, it can be noted that the children not only expressed warmth toward E.T. but also attempted humour.

Throughout both performances, fourteen words were the basis of their instruction in the first episode and nineteen words in the second. In

addition, they made reference to the term "word" twenty-eight times and "page" once.

Group 12: Mark (N.P. 59) chose Cordelaine (N.P. 48)

Mark and Cordelaine represented a unique performance in that they spelled, sounded out and then enunciated the whole word. In each instance, E.T.'s attention was drawn to the word under investigation.

Mark: E.T., what does C-A-B-B-A-G-E spell? c-a baj, cabbage, cabbage, cabbage. Right, E.T.

: Now, what does this word say right here? Gar--g-ar-den--garden.

: Okay, E.T., what's that word? It's the name of an animal. F-O-X. You know that? What's the sound of an "f"--"fff" [f sound], the sound of "o" o, the sound of "x" "x"--"ox" "fox" "fox."

: E.T., how do you spell "plant"? P-L-A-N-T. Yah, yah, yah [E.T. voice].

: E.T., what does C-O-R-N spell? Corn [E.T. voice].

: E.T., what does that spell? "Mat hew" Mathew because th goes [th sound].

: E.T., what does that say? Stephanie. Stephanie because "ph" goes [makes "f" sound].

In addition, the children utilized print found in the environment.

Mark: Okay, E.T., what does that say? a cros. See, E.T., that's an "a." I got it off my shirt [across].

An empty Edwards coffee can was placed on the table throughout the sessions, holding an array of pens and pencils to be used by the students in the episodes if they so chose. The print on this container was the source of the following instruction:

Cordelaine: This is how you make an "N," E.T. Here's a "D" and an "S."

During the session, the term "word" was used on five occasions.

Group 13: Ellen (N.P. 61) chose Maria (N.P. 54)

Ellen and Maria began their first episode with the oral reading of the selected story, "Gardens by the Brook." Their approach to teaching was rather unique. They would ask E.T. a word and it could be inferred that he guessed the identity. For example:

Ellen: What's the word?

Maria: No, it's not "again."

Ellen: No, it's not "garden." Yes, it's "dinner."

From this brief portion, it was demonstrated that each of E.T.'s attempts had few graphemes in common with the word under scrutiny. However, once E.T. had correctly identified the word, it was circled on the page.

The instructional practices utilized in the second episode was an expansion of the technique followed in the first. In addition to focussing E.T.'s attention on specific words in a contextual situation, the girls questioned E.T. re: the content of the story.

Maria: E.T., I'm going to read to you and then I'm going to ask you a question. . . . Okay, E.T. What did Mrs. Bear

plant in her garden? No, she didn't plant cabbage. Right, she planted flowers, E.T.

Maria: Okay, E.T., what did they say to Mrs. Bear?

However, on two occasions, the question asked related to the identification of a word.

Ellen: Okay, now I'm going to ask you a question. What is that word? No, it's not "Mr. Fox." That's right, it's "Mrs. Bear."

As Maria read the story, she focused E.T.'s attention on a picture in the text.

Maria: See, there was a stick across the river and she climbed on the stick. Okay, E.T.?

Throughout both episodes, reference was made to the term "word" nine times and "page" on five occasions.

Group 14: Missy (N.P. 28) chose Teresa (N.P. 91)

Missy and Teresa began their performance with an oral reading of the story "Gardens by the Brook."

Missy: I'm going to read to you and Teresa is going to write down some words. When Teresa calls the word and she writes them down, you say the word.

In addition, Missy alleviated anxiety associated with learning to read.

Missy: We can help you if you need to be helped.

An example of their instructional procedure is revealed in the following verbalization:

Teresa: I'm going to read you some more. Okay, E.T. Okay, wheat [pointed to word in text]. Okay, I'm going to read you some more. "I like corn." Now, can you say "corn"?

Spelling the words was the instructional approach utilized by the two girls in this episode. The example:

Missy: Okay, E.T., we're going to teach you how to read. We're going to ask you how to spell some words. How do you spell "wheat"? What did you say? He said, W-H-E-A-T. "Wheat."

Teresa: E.T., do you know how to spell garden? What did you say? G-A-R-D-E-N. Right, E.T. E.T., can you spell "cat"? C-A-T.

The episode continued in a similar manner with E.T. spelling out fourteen different words such as: "when," "dog," "lost," "and," "they," and "good." However, one exception to their instructional procedure occurred.

Teresa: E.T., now what we are going to do is make sentences. Okay, can you write? Okay, we'll write. The man had a hat.

Missy: How do you spell "hat"?

Generally, it appeared that the alphabetic methodology was the mode of instruction. That is, the spelling of the word using the correct symbol followed by a pronunciation of the word.

It is important to note that for this second episode, they did not begin with an oral reading. They generally dealt with whole words without resorting to meaning or associating sound to letters.

Throughout both episodes, reference was made to the terms "page," "word" and "sentence" on five different occasions.

Group 15: Rolph (N.P. 57) chose Junior (N.P. 77)

Rolph and Junior began the episode by establishing a procedure that was generally followed throughout both performances. E.T.'s attention was focussed on specific words located in the text.

Rolph: Just circle the words that we want E.T. to read.

Junior: E.T., what's that word?

However, two significant alterations occurred to their instruction. The first change involved terminology whereby E.T.'s attention was drawn to the larger meaning unit, the sentence.

Junior: What's this sentence?

The second change reflected a focussing on specific punctuation associated with the sentences.

Rolph: What's that E.T.? Right. Speaking marks.

Throughout both episodes, reference was made to the term "word" on fourteen occasions and "sentence" once.

Group 16: Sandy (N.P. 59) chose Roland (N.P. 54)

Utilizing the text, Roland began the performance with an assertion as to how to learn to read.

Roland: Okay, E.T., now if you want to learn to read, one of the most important things in life you have to sound out things except some words you really can't sound out. Now sound out this word.

Roland checked to determine whether E.T. knew the letters suggesting that a reader must be aware of this knowledge as well as the sound correspondence.

Roland: Do you know the letters? Okay, and now you just sound out this. You go "p e tuh er." You want to say that? . . . Yep, that's right, "Peter."

He further suggested that words must be put in memory.

Roland: Now as soon as you can you have to memorize these words.

After studying the individual words in a complete sentence, Roland drew E.T.'s attention to the whole sentence.

Roland: See the whole sentence. What's that? "Peter had three frisky goats."

Sandy reiterated Roland's claim that "some words you can't really sound out so you'll have to learn them." He further stated that "there's only one vowel in each word and two in this word." Sandy at this point demonstrated his knowledge of associating sound to letters.

Sandy: "Ea" so that's "e." Can you say e? What's that? "Each."

He continued to have E.T. "sound out words" and simultaneously drew his attention to words with the same sound and orthographic structure.

Sandy: Now, I want you to sound out that word. It's exactly the same as this. That says "a" and these other letters say "day."

Instruction altered at this point with the boys utilizing the store of paper and pencils to print words for E.T. to "figure out."

Roland: Well, we'll skip out the story. You know how to print? Well, I'll print, okay. I'll print now and you sit until you know what this word is.

After printing out three more words for E.T. to "sound out," instruction reverted to the initial procedure focussing on the selected story, "Peter and the Goats."

E.T. though assumed a more independent role reading more of the text rather than the boys centering instruction upon individual words. However, reminders to the procedures to utilize in word identification were verbalized.

Roland: Remember, I told you to sound out the words.

Sandy: Oh, boy, you can't get this fourth word. Now remember I told you to sound it out. "Cl-ever." "Clever," is that right? See if that's right.

As well, aid was offered to E.T. with reading unknown words.

Roland: Oh, he can't get the third word. Guess we'll have to help him.

The boys then generalized a phonics rule to help E.T.

Roland: Do you know that word? Now, remember sound it out. He don't know it. Well, sound out "lll" [sound of "l"] that's an "l." The "silent e," we'll cross that out. That way it will make it easier. He's right, "Luke."

Throughout both episodes, the boys utilized these procedures in instructing E.T. Also, it was noted that correct oral reading was a necessary element of E.T.'s reading performance.

Sandy: Okay, E.T., this is very important. You've got to get this last page right because it's your last turn to maybe read this book.

: That's good, E.T. You said every word right. Very good.

Speed was also considered an essential factor. However, no explanation was offered for the necessity of speed.

Roland: That's very good. He read that in less than a minute I bet. Lots of speed, remember, E.T.

Reference was made to the terms "page," "word," "sentence," and "letter,"--"page" on twenty-one occasions; "word" on twenty-four occasions; "sentence" on three occasions; "letter" on four occasions with two of these instances reflecting specific reference to "vowels" and one instance of letter referring to "capital letter." In addition, specific reference was made to the term "jail word" although no meaning was verbalized. However, an example was stated.

Roland: "At night" is a jail word.

Group 17: Susan (N.P. 99) chose Theresa (N.P. 91)

Theresa and Susan began the episode by introducing themselves to E.T. Immediately, Theresa indicated her knowledge of one example of genre thus:

Theresa: I'll read the narrative.

Whereupon Theresa read the dialogue in an E.T. voice and Susan read the remainder. As E.T. read, miscues were corrected by the girls acting as external regulators.

Theresa [E.T.]: Umm, Scurl.

Susan: Squirrel. Squirrel, E.T.

Theresa [E.T.]: Squirrel, right?

A slight variation in instructional procedure occurred as the girls began to write down words on the paper provided.

Susan: Now the next word has to be from here and I'll write it down, but you have to tell me what it says.

Theresa [E.T.]: Mrs. Air.

Susan: Bear, E.T., because she's not air. She doesn't float around.

Later, Susan brought E.T.'s attention to the specific features of the letter "s."

Theresa [E.T.]: Fos.

Susan: Fox, E.T. That's not an "s," E.T. An "s" looks like that.

Another change occurred as the episode proceeded. E.T. began to spell out the words which were being studied.

Susan: I'm going to write it down.

Theresa [E.T.]: Look.

Susan: It's a "b" not an "l."

Theresa [E.T.]: Book.

Susan: No, it has an "r."

Theresa [E.T.]: Oh, R-O-O-K.

Susan: No, it's bu rrr.

Theresa [E.T.]: Brook.

The performance continued thus, with monitoring evidenced.

Susan: That's mister, E.T.

Theresa [E.T.]: "Mister," spelled M-I-S-T-R.

Susan: T-E-R.

At this point, reference was made to the term "abbreviation" in respect to the word "mister."

Susan: But, E.T., this is the abbreviation. An abbreviation.

Theresa [E.T.]: What's "'breviation"?

The term abbreviation was defined through example and verbalization including the correct punctuation.

Susan: It's a small word. This is a long word, mister. But when I make it small, it has the first letter and the last letter and the dot.

Theresa [E.T.]: Oh, Mister. Not M-I-S-T-E-R but M-R dot.

The second episode was similar to the first performance in that E.T.'s miscues were corrected by an external regulator. In addition, miscues were spelled correctly in order to help with the correct pronunciation.

Susan: How do you say this?

Theresa [E.T.]: Wabbit.

Susan: No, there's an "r" there.

Theresa [E.T.]: Mabbit.

Susan: No, there's no "M." R-A-B-B-I-T, rabbit.

Theresa [E.T.]: Rabbit.

To give greater attention to the miscues, the words were circled for later review.

Throughout both episodes, thirty-one miscues were corrected.

Group 18: Chester (N.P. 99) chose Darwin (N.P. 20)

Chester and Darwin did not use the selected story as source material as they did in the continuous oral reading of "Gardens by the Brook" in the first episode. Rather, they focused on the spelling of words in isolation. From the following verbalization it was evident that the boys did not agree as to what constituted the content of reading instruction:

Chester: I'm going to teach him.

Darwin: You got to teach him reading, Chester.

Chester: No, we just have to put down a word. "Seven"--spell it. What's the first letter in seven"?

Darwin: Probably doesn't know anything.

Chester: S-E-V-E-N--"seven."

Darwin [E.T.]: S-E-J-R-U.

Chester: No, the first ones are right but the last three, they aren't right.

Darwin [E.T.]: Okay, I'll try and get it.

At this point, Darwin put a pencil in E.T.'s hand and commenced to print the correct spelling. In addition, Darwin simultaneously changed roles--from that of E.T. to instructor as he then asked for the spelling of the word "one."

Darwin: Let's see you spell "one."

Chester assumed the role of E.T. spelling one.

Chester: E-N-O.

Darwin monitored the spelling of the word.

Darwin: You got all the letters right this time, but you got them backwards.

The episode continued in a similar manner.

Chester: How do you spell "three"?

Darwin: E-R-T-H.

Chester: Nope.

Darwin: He spelled it backwards.

Chester: There's two "e's."

Darwin: I said E-E-R-T-H.

Chester: Well, he got all the letters, all the letters, I think. He spelled them backwards.

At this point, some time was spent off-task discussing and comparing E.T. used in the play episode and E.T.s owned by the participants in the study.

Chester: He's bigger than the one I got.

Darwin: He's bigger than mine. Mine's only about that size.

Chester: Yah, he's fatter, too.

Darwin: He's fat and look at his feet--big.

The episode continued similarly as if no discussion had occurred.

Darwin: "Two." Tell me how to spell "two."

Chester [E.T.]: T-O-W.

Darwin: Nope, even I spelled "two" wrong.

Chester: You spelled TOW [TOH].

Chester verbalized a pronunciation of E.T.'s spelling of the word "two." However, he corrected this pronunciation as follows:

Chester: You spelled T-O-W [how]. That's tow [rhymes with how].

Darwin: Now, E.T., tell me how to spell "two."

Chester [E.T.]: T-W-A [the boys laughed].

The episode continued.

Chester: How do you spell "jungle"?

Darwin: J-O-U-S-T.

Chester: You got the first two letters right.

At this point, Darwin suggested that this instructional procedure did not really constitute the teaching of reading.

Darwin: Now we got to teach him some reading out of this.

Chester: We're supposed to teach him reading.

Darwin: No, we're not supposed to do all this.

Chester: Okay, the last time we taught him reading it was "Gardens by the Brook."

Darwin: Yah, we got to read this to him and ask him to read something to us.

Chester: Do we have to do that?

Darwin: Okay.

Chester: Okay.

Despite the agreement as to the instructional procedure to follow, the boys did not institute their plan of action, other than focussing E.T.'s attention for a brief time to the text.

Darwin: Chester, E.T.'s supposed to be looking here. How do you spell "guard"?

Chester: That isn't how you spell guard--the way you spelled it Darwin anyway.

Darwin: E.T., how do you spell "guard"?

Chester [E.T.]: G-U-S-E.

Darwin: Wrong, I didn't even spell it right.

At this point, Chester attempted to correct the spelling of "guard." However, Darwin was aware that Chester's spelling was incorrect.

Chester: I'll show you how to spell "guard." Guard is G-A-U-R-D.

Darwin: No, it isn't.

Chester: Yes, it is, that's "guard." The way I said it, that's how you spell "guard." That's the way.

Table 4.2

Summary of Total Student Performance by Category

Categories used in Analyses of Data in Main Study	Number of Occurrences Showing Student Knowledge and Awareness of Reading Processes and Strategies by Student Group																		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	Total
I. Student Knowledge and Awareness of Conventions of Print																			
A. Left-to-right progression	1		1		1	4		1	1										9
B. References to letters, words, sentences, paragraphs and pages			17	15	12	12	35	7	3		29	5	14	5	15	52			221
C. References to book parts such as table of contents and titles		1	3		2	3			1										10
D. Punctuation					2	2	1			1			1		1		1		9
E. Capitalization										1						1			2
Category Total	1	1	21	15	17	21	36	8	5	2	29	5	15	5	16	53	1	0	251
II. Student Knowledge and Awareness of Reading Processes																			
A. Attending to text	1	2	2	15	3	8	19	9	6	5	33	7	12	19	15	52	31	1	240
B. Associating sounds to letters			1	6	2	1										7			17
C. Associating meaning to words	1				2	3	17		2			6					1		31
D. Discriminating			1					4				3				1	1		11
III. Student Knowledge and Awareness of Reading Strategies																			
A. For word identification																			
1. Sounding out letters		1		6	1	2			1							3			14
2. Asking an external source	3	2		9	2	1			1					1		1	31		51
3. Using contextual clues				1	1														2
4. Identifying sight words				8		6	34				33	1	12	5	14				113
5. Spelling out words				4			2		1	8		4		14		6		6	45
6. Blending by sight and sound				1						5									6
Sub Total	3	3	0	29	4	9	36	0	3	13	33	5	12	20	14	10	31	6	231
B. For comprehension																			
1. Using pictures to understand words and ideas	1	2		2				5					1						11
2. Elements of story structure																			
a. Characters				1						1									2
b. Action			1																1
c. Plot (what the story is about)			1					1											2
3. Using questions																			
a. "wh" questions		1	5										2						8
b. Inference questions			1										1						
Sub Total	1	3	8	3	0	0	0	6	0	1	0	0	3	0	6	0	0	0	25
C. For locating information in library					1														1
D. For correcting misconceptions (monitoring)		1		1					1							1	31	6	41
E. For generalizing and application of rules				2												1			3
Category Total	4	7	8	35	5	9	36	6	4	14	33	5	15	20	14	12	62	12	301

Table 4.2

Summary of Total Student Performance by Category

Categories used in Analyses of Data in Main Study	Number of Occurrences Showing Student Knowledge and Awareness of Reading Processes and Strategies by Student Group																		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	Total
IV. Student Knowledge and Awareness of																			
A. Concept for reading		1		1															2
B. Oral mode of reading																			
1. Words				1		1								1					3
2. Sentences															1		1		2
3. Text	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2		1	1	2	1	1	29
4. Intonation patterns					3														3
5. Speed (automaticity)					1											1			2
Category Total	2	3	2	4	6	3	2	1	2	2	2	2	0	2	1	3	2	1	41
All Categories Total	9	13	35	75	35	45	109	28	19	23	97	28	42	46	47	128	98	14	892

The following section, Part Three, represents a further analysis of findings to synthesize some of the ideational units extracted from the eighteen episodes to give a more detailed report of the findings across groups. The emphasis here is on the summative description of the findings of the group of thirty-six students rather than the separate eighteen groups of two students each. Selected components of each major category are addressed. Table 4.2 represents the overall picture of the thirty-six children. However, the presentation in this next section does not follow the categorical ordering appearing on Table 4.2. The order of presentation for the summative description of the findings is as follows:

1. Category IV B
2. Category III A
3. Category I B
4. Category II A, C
5. Category III B
6. Category IV A

PART THREE

SYNTHESIS OF STUDY FINDINGS BY TOTAL STUDENT SAMPLE AND DISCUSSION OF THOSE FINDINGS

Student Knowledge and Awareness of Oral Mode of Reading (Category IV B)

One of the most consistent procedures utilized by the children throughout both teaching of reading episodes was the oral presentation of the story to E.T., the stuffed toy. According to Table 4.2, twenty-nine performances began with an alternate oral reading of the story; however,

it was noted that this figure did not represent the actual number of times that the story was presented orally in each performance. For example, Group 9 during one episode, re-read the story three times. In addition, variations occurred in the format of their presentation.

Consider Group 15's performance.

Junior: What's this sentence?

This procedure was utilized in conjunction with the boys alternately oral reading the sentences.

The participants of Group 6's performance disagreed on the approach to the oral mode of reading.

Junella: Okay, so you'll have to learn how to sound out the words and that funny little shape right there is an "O" and you go "o-won," "one" and that says "night." That says "on," that says "the."

Brenda: Yah, but don't say that says "the" and that says "goats," just hurry up.

However, Junella persisted with a similar approach.

Junella: That's how "jumped" is spelled, that's how "in" is spelled and that's how "to" is spelled.

Brenda demonstrated how she wanted the story read.

Brenda: Quickly, hurry. 'Cause that's all I did because I read quickly.

It was noted that on occasion E.T. appeared to be reading silently; however, the verbalization indicated that the participants imagined his oral performance.

Brenda: Come on, E.T. Now, I'm going to get you to read a page all by yourself this time, okay. [E.T. read silently and Brenda concluded] Right, you remembered that word all along [Group 6].

Discussion. These findings could suggest as Tovey (1976) concluded that children perceived reading as an oral task. However, it could also be hypothesized that an oral reading of the story was the instructional practice followed in the classroom and that the children thought they ought to emulate that teacher's practice. Although both of these assumptions may be true, the researcher suggested that extraneous factors may have exerted some influence as well. E.T. was an alien; therefore, the children may have generalized that

1. E.T. wanted to hear how they as earthlings read in school.
2. E.T. required the oral reading in order to hear the sound of the English language and learn more about its structure.

Krystal: E.T. came from a different planet. He didn't know how to talk or read so that's why we teachers help E.T. [Group 2].

In this next episodic portion of Group 6, the girls added the following explanation:

Brenda: We're trying to teach you how to read.

Junella: What did you say? [Question directed to E.T.]

Brenda: He said that he found it hard to talk all the words in the story so we'll help him so the other children can teach him.

The children's concern with E.T.'s possible difficulty with enunciating English words was confirmed by Mitchell.

Mitchell: Could you say the words, "turnip fields"? [Group 5].

However, aspects related specifically to the art of oral reading were verbalized. John stated:

John: What you have to do is imitate and read books.

: When you look in a book, it will help if you read with expression [illustrated expressionless oral reading]. Ah, boring! [Group 5].

Later Mitchell [Group V] revealed that speed was a very important factor and since he demonstrated this point while oral reading, the researcher assumed that he was referring to this mode only.

Mitchell: If you read too fast, you don't understand [Group 5].

Speed was a significant factor for Roland as well.

Roland: That's very good. He read that in less than a minute, I bet. Lots of speed, remember, E.T. [Group 17].

The examples suggested that the boys were aware of automaticity; however, they failed to explain the significance of speed or whether the same rate should be utilized with all types of reading associated with either the silent or oral mode.

The necessity of punctuation as it related to oral presentation was brought to the forefront in this next episodic portion found in Group 5's performance.

John: When you come to a period, well, it's as big as a dot what you have to do is . . .

Mitchell interjected: take a break.

John confirmed this point.

John: Stop and take a little break.

Subsequently, John orally read a lengthy portion, stopping suddenly.

John: I need a breath, so they put a period.

Student Knowledge and Awareness of Reading Strategies (Cagetory III A)

Word Identification. Findings indicated children utilized various procedures to aid E.T. in identifying unknown words. The most predominant practice was the identification of sight words, a method utilized by eight groups to identify 113 words (Category III A.4). However, one group used this procedure with only one word whereas two groups utilized sight word identification for thirty-three and thirty-four words respectively (Groups 7 and 9) suggesting that the entire episodes centered around word identification. The average was approximately fourteen words with five of the eight groups falling below this point.

Another procedure utilized by nine groups was "asking an external source" (Category III A.2). The tabulated figure fifty-one however, represents both a direct reference to the regulator such as "ask your teacher" as well as the children acting as an external source in the identification of words.

Eight groups chose to identify forty-five words by "spelling them out" (Category III A.5). In addition, six groups either made direct reference to the procedure "sounding out" or associated sounds to letter in the identification of words--fourteen instances, Category III A.1.

Generally, most groups utilized more than one procedure in word identification with one group (Group 4) relying on all six different approaches. However, it was noted that only two groups incorporated the use of contextual clues in the identification of words (Category A.3). This represented two instances out of a total possible 231 occurrences of word identification and/or reference to word identification procedures.

The following three episodic portions were an example of an approach utilized by the children in which the predominant feature for word identification was the sounding out of letters (Category III A.1). In discussion, this approach although identified only fourteen times out of 231 was considered by the researcher to require a higher level of thought processes on the part of the student because they were not only modelling the teaching procedure but were also giving specific examples using this methodology. Not addressed were three approaches, asking an external source (Category III A.2), identifying sight words (Category III A.4), and spelling out words (Category III A.5) because they mirrored a teaching procedure only.

Winnifred: No, you don't tell him what the word is, you have to tell him how to sound it out.

June: Okay, E.T., what does that say? Never have I taught you to sound it out. /wuh/or/ [attending].

Winnifred: Or, or the "or" says /or/ [sound/symbol association].

June: Or.

Both: Word [attempted synthesis using "or"].

June: Does that sound right? No it doesn't [evaluating].

Winnifred: No.

At this point, the girls evaluated or monitored their knowledge of associating sound to symbol with their knowledge of oral language.

June: So maybe, we should say wood.

Winnifred: Let's make it sound like "er". Let's make it sound like an "er."

June: W-O-R-D.

Winnifred: That sounds like a jail word [a word that is not phonically regular].

June: Word.

Winnifred: That should be if we wanted to. This is a jail word. If you wanted that to sound proper that would be. We would have to cross out the "or." We would have to put "er" instead of "or."

June: So that says "word" [synthesis].

In discussion, the girls exhibited their awareness of the different spellings for the sound "er;" thereby, demonstrating to E.T. that English can be inconsistent with irregularities which may cause problems. Finally, June made a suggestion to E.T.:

June: You try spelling the word now.

Winnifred: Okay, take a hold of the pencil and spell the word.

June: Like I did. Good. You spelled word okay. [Group 9]

This dialogue, by way of discussion, reflected several reading processes in action. Initially the girls attended to the term, "word." Simultaneously, visual and auditory skills were utilized as the girls actualized the process of analyzing in a sequential ordering of decoding

using the process of associating symbol to sound. At this point, the girls attempted a correct pronunciation by synthesizing the known elements of the term. In addition, they appeared to rely on both their speaking and listening vocabularies as well as their knowledge of associating sound to symbol utilizing the evaluative component of metacognition to determine the appropriateness of their decisions. Through the processes of analyzing, discriminating, associating sound to symbol, and synthesizing the correct pronunciation of the term was verbalized. Finally by involving E.T. in the actual spelling of the term using a pencil and paper, the girls concluded this portion of the episode by assigning him a tangible task. By manipulating the pencil, E.T. received sensations both tactilly and visually.

The following episode reflected an adapted form of the intrinsic phonics approach in that the words were derived directly from the text.

Roland: Did you remember what I told you? Sound out words.

Sandy reiterated the same instruction.

Sandy: Remember, sound out the words.

Later, Roland applied his knowledge of phonics to an example.

Roland: I'll give him one right out the story, too. Do you know that word? Now remember, sound it out. He don't know it. We'll sound it out. "ll" ["l" sound], that's an "l." The silent e, we'll cross that out. That way it will make it easier. He's right, "Luke." [Group 17]

In discussion, although Sandy did not explain the significance of the "silent e," it may be inferred that he recognized that the letter "e" was not essential to the correct pronunciation of the word.

In the next episode, the words in a sentence were either identified through associating sound to symbol or as sight words.

Ralph: You know what that says?

Samuel [E.T.]: No.

Ralph: "O" and "n" makes "on" okay.

Samuel: Okay, listen, E.T., here. This is "O" makes the ŏ [ah] sound and then but sometimes "o" can be "ō" sound too. And the "n" just makes the "nnn" sound and there's no such word as "n."

Ralph: Oh, E.T. This is "the."

Samuel [E.T.]: The.

Ralph: "T-h" together sounds like this [makes "th" sound] "e" is just "ah."

Ralph: You know what the next word is "way."

Samuel: Like this "On the way" and then this is "to." "On the way to his nap." I'm just going to read the whole sentence. Okay, you see that? That's "On the way to his nap the other day." [Group 4]

Comprehension (Category III B). Generally, little information was gleaned from the data reflecting student attempts to derive meaning from text. Five groups, however, used pictures to either understand and/or embellish the meanings of words and ideas eleven times. In addition,

three groups utilized "wh" questions representing eight instances, five of these occurrences were from the performance of one group (Group 3). As well, this group attempted using an inference question. In all, there were twenty occasions where students attempted to derive meaning from text.

1. Using Pictures to Understand Words and Ideas (Category III B.1)

The following episodic portions represented the children's verbalized knowledge and awareness of reading strategies associated with deriving meaning from print and are reported as support to the findings.

After Andrew had read the first page of the story "Peter and the Goats," he focused E.T.'s attention on the picture in the text.

Andrew: See, see XXX. Every night Peter went to get the goats and drive them home [Group 1].

This example represented the only occurrence in their performance where reference was made to the information available in pictures. However, Group 8 utilized this procedure on five different occasions. Following are two examples:

Charles: See and there he is pointing to the goats because he's sad because he can't get them out.

Kristopher: See how he can't get the goats out. They're not scared of a rabbit. Oh, look what's there now.

Five of the eighteen groups incorporated this practice into their teaching instruction.

2. Elements of Story Structure (Category III B.2)

Four groups verbalized five instances of comprehension related specifically to story structure. The following episodic portions reflected the children's verbalized reference to these elements either in question form or in a direct statement.

Ann: E.T., do you know what the rabbit is doing?

Nicole: E.T., can you tell us what the story is about so far? [Group 3].

Samuel: Oh, Garfield's the name of the cat. Poukee's the name of the teddy bear [Group 4].

Kristopher related the central theme of the story.

Kristopher: There's one thing that is happening in the story. How could he get the goats out of the turnip field? Right, he couldn't. [Group 8]

June indicated that she was aware of who the main and subordinate characters were in the story and their significance to the author's choice of the title.

June: That was a good title for it because it was mostly about Peter and the goats, not so much the main characters. Peter and the goats were the main characters and not so much the bee or the rabbit or the fox. They weren't there in the whole story. They were there for part of the story, the ending part [Group 9].

3. Using Questions (Category III B.3)

Three groups utilized questions as a procedure for checking comprehension and for focusing attention on specific text elements. One group (Group 3) utilized this procedure six times.

The following episodic portions reflected the children's questions directed to E.T.

Ann: Where's the title?

: E.T., do you know what the rabbit is doing?

Nicole: E.T., can you tell us what the story is about so far?

Nicole: What kind of hen? What color was she?

In addition, Nicole stated an inference question.

Nicole: Do you think she'll do it all over again?

Correcting Misconceptions (Category III D)

Forty-six instances of monitoring were reflected in the children's verbalizations in six episodes; however, thirty-one occurred in the performance of Group 17. It was noted that the majority of these occurrences reflected the children acting as an instructor. Two examples follow:

1. Theresa [E.T.]: Umm, scurl.

Susan: Squirrel, squirrel, E.T.

Theresa [E.T.]: Squirrel, right.

2. Theresa [E.T.]: Fox.

Susan: Fox, E.T. That's not an "s" E.T. An "s" looks like that.

However, there was only one example of self-monitoring where a child utilized his knowledge of language and the content in which the word appeared to identify and confirm a response.

John: . . . and if you didn't know the word "had" you can say "hid." Peter hid three frisky goats and then say each thing. So if you think "hid" is wrong, you know because Peter hid three frisky goats. You would say where he hid three frisky goats. But there it says "each day the goats sleep" [Group 5].

Student Knowledge and Awareness of Conventions of Print (Category I)

Referring back to the categories of Clay (1969) and Holdaway (1979) outlined in Chapter II, their procedures were utilized as a framework for analyzing the verbalized ideational units of the groups of grade two students reflecting conventions of print.

Reference to Letters, Words, Sentences, Paragraphs and Pages (Category I B). Thirteen groups of students made reference to the instructional terms letter(s), word(s), sentence(s), paragraph(s), or page(s) on 205 occasions. The range of occurrences was from three to fifty-two yielding an average of approximately sixteen instances per group performance. Nine of these group performances fell below this level.

In the children's verbalization, their knowledge of conventions of print regarding sentences were revealed.

John: I'll read a sentence, then you read a sentence and then he'll read the next sentence [Group 5].

However in this next episodic portion, an example of a sentence was stated:

Bernice: Now the word you know. I will teach you a sentence. "I will plant some popcorn" [Group 7].

Children as well made reference to letters either through associating sound to symbol or stating the word "letter."

Mitchell: E.T., you made a mistake because this is just one letter. His eyes are pointed the wrong way [Group 5].

Ralph: "th" together sounds like this [makes "th" sound] [Group 4].

Nicole: Can you tell what this letter says [Group 3].

Reference was often made either to page number or a specific page by directing E.T.'s attention to it.

Ann: Okay, now, you try and read that page [Group 3].

Junella: Okay, turn to the page and show E.T. where [Group 6].

Sonny: That's the end. There's more time. Turn to page 59 [Group 1].

Although no individual child defined word, E.T.'s attention was often directed to a single word either through pointing and/or circling or a direct reference to the term. For example:

Ralph: Let him see the words [Group 17].

Ralph: When you're finished just go over it slowly and show him

the different words. Okay, that's "I" and that's "love" and that's "sunbeam" [Group 4].

Ralph: You tell me the words and I'll sound them out [Group 4].

Rolph: Just circle the words that we want E.T. to read [Group 15].

In addition, features of a word were verbalized.

Samuel: And there's no such word as "n" [Group 4].

John: What you have to do is separate a word. Like this word, be-cause [Group 5].

Mitchell: That's a jail word. It's a word that doesn't sound like it's supposed to, right [Group 5].

Student Knowledge and Awareness of Reading Processes (Category II)

Attending to Text (Category II A). Of the reading processes identified from their verbalizations in the performances, the children drew E.T.'s attention to either the page of print as a whole or as individual words on 240 occasions out of a tallied total of 299 instances. That attending to text was a significant finding was reflected in the involvement by all groups in this process to some degree.

The following few examples reflected various methods that children utilized to draw E.T.'s attention to the text.

1. Jane: You better start fixing up the arms of them to write with and read because you'll have to move them to where your spot is and that's how we read that story [Group 2].

2. Nicole: . . . Now today we're going to teach you how to read a story. Can you tell what this letter says? [Group 3].

3. Ann [E.T.]: Where's the title?

Nicole: Title is the thing in big letters [Group 3].

4. Ralph: Okay, E.T., this is "the" [Group 4].

Associating Meaning to Words (Category II C). Seven groups verbalized thirty-one meanings reflecting the categories outlined in Chapter II. However, it was observed that except for the pilot study in school one, no examples of the category "concrete" were verbalized. Examples of the data for each of the categories will follow.

1. Abstract Category: Conceptual. Examples of verbalized ideational units reflecting an abstract understanding of the term were categorized using the descriptor abstract conceptual.

Theresa: What's abbreviation?

Susan: It's a small word. This is a long word "mister" but when I make it small it has the first letter and the last letter and the dot [Group 17].

Junella: What does "frisky" mean--like their hair sticks up, like full of energy [Group 9].

2. Abstract Category: Descriptive. Some ideational units of meaning reflected an even more substantial input of background information. By intermeshing the author's intended meaning in addition to relating a meaning based on prior experience, the resulting response exhibited the child's ability to verbalize multiple meanings:

Junella: . . . and drive them (goats) home. Yah, not pick them up in the car and drive them home, just walk them home [Group 9].

In addition to the verbalized multiple meanings, it can be noted that the student was able to provide two synonyms for the word drive.

Another episodic portion revealed that experience played a vital role in extrapolating the meaning of crying. Therefore, a considerable degree of reading between the lines was essential to derive meaning as the experience was associated with the definition.

Junella: You know what, yesterday Brenda got her teeth pulled and she didn't cry. Are you going to get some teeth pulled? Are you going to cry? [Group 6].

3. Abstract Category: Circular. In some instances, the children defined the words in terms of the words themselves. These were categorized abstract circular. The following examples exemplified a circular definition.

Mary: Again means when somebody does it again.

The following definition was a collaborated attempt to define across.

Mary: Across means that when you go across a thing.

Bernice: A bridge.

Mary: A bridge.

Bernice: Or a mountain, like.

Mary: Or a brook [Group 7].

4. Abstract Category: Vague. In some of the children's attempted definitions, it appeared that they had little understanding of the meaning of the term. For example:

Brenda: See the word "brook." Like it's a brook or a pond or something [Group 6].

5. Abstract Category: Gestural. In this particular category, the children verbalized a portion of the meaning and then elaborated upon the meaning through the use of non-verbal cues.

As Brenda read from the text "makes fun of the little bee," Junella mimicked taunting laughter exemplifying the meaning of "making fun" [Group 6].

While Andrew read "Peter is crying," Sonny took E.T.'s hand, uttering "Wah! Wah!" as he rubbed E.T.'s eyes [Group 1].

6. Abstract Category: Functional. Children verbalized a specific function of the featured term as illustrated in the following examples:

Mary: And the next one is "flowers." Flowers smell so sweet [Group 7].

Bernice: Now the word "sun." Now it means that the sun is bright [Group 7].

Bernice: And E.T., this is the word "honey." It's good for breakfast on your toast [Group 7].

Brenda: This is a kind of microphone that people use when they're singing. I wonder if its on or off. It's on. It's on [Group 6].

Bernice: You don't say cab. That means that it's a cab, like what you ride in [Group 7].

: Okay, now, we're going to do the word "corn." Corn is good for you for supper [Group 7].

Mary: And the next one is "bike." Bike is something that somebody rides on [Group 7].

7. Abstract Category: Synonym. As the children defined words, they verbalized a synonym for the featured word.

Bernice: You love each other and you care about each other [Group 7].

Bernice: Okay, E.T., the word is "be--be--be--careful" and "watch out" [Group 7].

8. Abstract Category: Exemplar. In terms of defining a word, children verbalized an example of the featured word.

Bernice: Now, the word you know. I will teach you a sentence. "I will plant some popcorn" [Group 7].

Charles: It's really an easy letter, an "l" [Group 8].

9. Abstract Category: Descriptive, Function. The following definition reflected a combination of two of the categories, descriptive and function.

Bernice: And bees work really hard and cooperate to make the honey for the people [Group 7].

10. Gestural. Children sometimes defined the words in terms of a gesture only.

Bernice: I've got another word for you. It's in the front page "jump." Like the rabbit jumped up over the bridge [demonstrated with her hand, jumped] [Group 7].

Bernice: Now we're going to do something else. We're going to do a clap.

Mary: Clap [clapped hands together].

Bernice: Snap [snapped fingers].

Mary: Snap [snapped fingers].

Bernice: And blink [blinked]. And we're going to do something else. Okay, E.T., stamp your feet [stamped feet] [Group 7].

Student Knowledge and Awareness of Concept of Reading (Category IV A)

Two instances occurred in the verbalizations of the children reflecting their concept of reading. John and Mitchell (Group 5) verbalized their knowledge of how to teach reading considering the sequence of learning in addition to applying the process of monitoring.

John: Before you learn to read, you have to learn the word. You have to learn the sound of the letter.

Michael: And the words.

John: So what you have to do if you don't know the sound of the letter how you think "P" says to go "Pah" "Pah" "Pah "Patiper" [Peter].

It appeared that the boys' perception of reading reflected the whole word approach followed by the application of the process of associating sound to symbol, first to letter and then to the word.

Mary verbalized her concept of reading thus:

Mary: Do you know what that word is, it's "this." And if you want to know how to read you have to say the whole sentence: "This is a good day," said Mrs. Bear. [Group 7]

She was aware that knowing words in isolation was important; however, she inferred that the essence of reading was one's ability to comprehend the whole sentence as a complete meaningful unit.

SUMMARY

Chapter IV presents the findings and the results of the study in three parts. Initially, a more detailed account of the student sample who participated in the pilot and main study was discussed. Information was then presented reflecting the children's reaction to the recording of their verbalization and to E.T. In addition, a description of the children's participation in the role-playing activity was addressed.

In Part Two, the children's verbalizations in each of the eighteen groups were summarized and the findings compiled in table form utilizing categories established in the pilot studies in addition to the inclusion of any new categories arising from the performances. Finally, examples extracted from all performances reflecting various categories were synthesized to give an overview of the major findings.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS OF STUDY

In this chapter, the study is summarized in terms of its purpose, design, and research technique used. Major findings and conclusions centering around the children's verbalized knowledge and awareness of reading processes and strategies are outlined and consideration is given to the implications for further research and for educational practices.

SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

The purpose of the study was to describe the grade two students' knowledge and awareness of reading processes and strategies as revealed in their verbalization during the assigned play task of teaching reading to E.T. Two research questions were asked.

1. What knowledge and awareness is verbalized of reading processes as groups of grade two children teach E.T. to read in a play group setting?
2. What knowledge and awareness of reading strategies is exhibited by groups of grade two students as they teach a large stuffed toy, E.T. to read?

The study was descriptive in nature and data were gathered through audio and videotaping of timed play episodes. There were two pilot studies preceding the main study. An orientation period in pilot study

one was initially conducted to acquaint the students with the researcher, with E.T. and introduce the students to the research. This was followed by a multi-staged second pilot study in which the students self-selected into groups of two, selected two themes for the practice performances, and read the story made available for the students' use in the assigned task if they so desired. In addition, the pilot study was conducted to provide an opportunity for the researcher to see if data would be forthcoming and later to establish and refine the categorical systems for classifying the data of the main study.

The thirty-six children in groups of two performed in the main study in a designated area outside of the classroom for two sessions, the first approximately ten minutes and the second about thirteen minutes. The sample of nine groups of two students each from each of two schools were chosen at random to include all ability groups for the main study. The data collection took place on six successive days at alternate times beginning the first week in June. The audio and videotaping for each class included the pilot study and excluded the practice runs. The data were analyzed in terms of several categories structured around knowledge and awareness of reading processes and strategies.

MAJOR FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS BY RESEARCH QUESTION

1. What knowledge and awareness is verbalized of reading processes as groups of grade two children teach E.T. to read in a play group setting?

Essentially as the children oral read the selected story, they verbalized considerable information reflecting the reading process of attending. Attending to print was achieved generally through the children's reference to letters, words, sentences, paragraphs, and/or pages either during and/or after the oral presentation of the story. In addition, instances noted on videotape of left-to-right progression were demonstrated by the children as they directed E.T.'s hand in a left-to-right manner focussing his attention on print.

Several occurrences of associating meaning to words reflecting characteristics of commonality and variability of definition were revealed in the children's performances. The Abstract Category with meanings mirroring a function of the target term were the most predominant category group. Other definitions revealed varying degrees of abstractness to include a good verbalized understanding of the term based occasionally on experience only and at other times an integration of author's intended meaning and student experiential background. These definitions reflected multiple meanings, synonyms, examples, and meanings based on gestures only. In addition, the children verbalized an example of both circular and vague definitions suggesting that the extent of their experience with the featured word was inadequate in order for them to have formed a concept of the term.

The reading process of associating sounds to letters was also reflected in the children's verbalizations. This finding is significant in that the children not only utilized a teaching procedure of "sound it out" but actually used examples to demonstrate the concepts. However, it

was noted that the children generally did not utilize the process of predicting in order to identify words.

In addition, almost totally absent was any subscription to the flow of meaning or to the total meaning of the text.

2. What knowledge and awareness of reading strategies are exhibited by groups of grade two students as they teach a large stuffed toy, E.T. to read?

As children generally orally presented the story to E.T., either during the reading or after the story had been read, they focused a considerable amount of instructional time on the identification of words. Most prevalent amongst the instructional procedures utilized was the method reflecting the identification of sight words. Other methods utilized by the students mirrored teacher instructional practices which involved "asking an external source" and "spelling out words." In addition, monitoring was noted as the children acted within the capacity of their instructional position. However, of these tabulated occurrences, little evidence was available for any self-regulating monitoring.

As the children instructed E.T., they utilized "wh" questions to help E.T. derive meaning from print. However, this procedure was utilized minimally and often reflected questions requiring text specific answers rather than answers which necessitated thought beyond what information was available in the text. In addition, some evidence of the elements of story structure (character, action, plot) utilized as a comprehension tool was verbalized; however, this was minimal and in light of the importance of this feature to the students' overall general

understanding was a finding that suggested that little instructional time was devoted to this concept.

CLASSROOM IMPLICATIONS EMERGING FROM THE STUDY

Duffy (1983) has stated that descriptive research generates questions rather than answers. For the writer, certain questions have arisen. According to the completed study, it appears that the oral mode of presentation was an integral part of the reading instruction. The emphasis on the oral mode where it was considered that no good reading could occur without the ability to call words readily was the focus of instruction before the turn of the century. However, by the 1920's the prevailing wisdom shifted from instruction with an emphasis on the oral mode of presentation to the teaching of effective rapid silent reading. Why does this practice persist despite early evidence (Gray, 1938; Judd & Buswell, 1922; Thorndike, 1917) contrary to the practicability of oral reading? The researcher suggests that this activity has continued despite rich and revolutionary findings about the nature of reading and reading comprehension because improved means of instruction have not been implemented into the classroom teacher's repertoire of practices. According to Duffy (1983), it appears that the challenge is to develop direct methods for teaching basic reading comprehension skills, basic study skills, and basic thinking skills to children who, in the absence of explicit instruction are not acquiring these skills today. Children learn what they are taught and what they practice. Accordingly, when a variable is identified that makes a difference in reading ability, it

should be taught systematically until students have mastered it. In this study, the children overwhelmingly focussed on the smaller unit, the word, with little attention to its meaning. In addition, there was little evidence of an overall understanding of stories. However, research conducted by Durkin in 1979 revealed that instruction for comprehension accounted for less than 1% of instructional time. She reported a prevalence of questioning (literal level) and mentioning. In an attempt to explain the absence of comprehension instruction, she extended her research to include an assessment of basal readers currently being used in classrooms (1981). Durkin's conclusions re: textbooks were similar to what she observed teachers doing in the classroom in that little was available in guidebooks which could be categorized as comprehension instruction with prescribed procedures reflecting mentioning and literal questioning.

In addition, a study by Duffy and McIntyre (cited in Duffy, 1983) indicated that teachers seldom showed children how to do tasks related to reading but supplied correctives in response to errors made on text activities. After interviewing the teachers, it was found that they believed that this was what they were supposed to be doing. Anderson's research (cited in Duffy, 1983) revealed that children viewed seatwork as something to get done rather than an activity to make sense of reading. In other words, they were given no purpose for the activity. Therefore, it is suggested that greater instructional attention be directed toward developing the children's ability to understand and verbalize the larger unit of text meaning including the central theme, synthesizing of text information, and predicting of both words and text.

Children responded very positively to the puppet, E.T., as they held, patted, and treated him like an older sibling may care for a younger one. In addition, as they assumed a dominant role, their verbalizations were uninhibited. Therefore, educators should consider the value of changing the classroom orientation on occasion to a more play centered environment where children can be active learners responsible for their own learning.

Teachers should also consider the importance of peer teaching. That is, children interactively working together to develop and refine concepts. Peer teaching within the realm of play is a natural medium for children to help one another extend and clarify existing knowledge.

FURTHER RESEARCH

Research studies could be designed to address these questions.

1. Children demonstrated various approaches to teaching reading. Are they reflecting their predilection of their own modality strength or the modality preference of the teacher's instruction?
2. E.T. and puppetry appeared to be a natural outgrowth of children's play. Could E.T. be utilized in a similar interactive group situation to reinforce concepts taught in a classroom?
3. As an instructional device, would E.T. be more effective with concept development with the low achievers or the high ability grouping?
4. Probe techniques have been the prime source of information in previous research (Canney & Winograd, 1979; Meyers & Paris, 1978;

Reid, 1966-67; Weintraub & Denny, 1964-65). What kinds of information would be available utilizing a probe technique prior to the teaching of E.T. by groups of two students in a play group setting? What kinds of information would be available from initially teaching E.T. to read by groups of two students in a play group setting followed by a probe technique?

5. In the pilot study, the reading processes synthesizing and predicting were in evidence. However, these two processes were not utilized by the children in the main study. Are synthesizing and predicting available as processes to Grade two children?

CONCLUDING STATEMENT

The ability to verbalize one's understandings and knowledge is important as the verbiage is indicative of the knowledge and control that a child has over her own learning activities including reading. However, the ability to reflect upon one's own thinking and to be aware of this activity is a late developing skill but it does have important implications for the child's effectiveness as an active learner. Therefore, in terms of producing competent readers, one of the teacher's responsibilities is to ensure that the child becomes knowledgeable about the many processes involved in reading and to introduce her to effective self-problem detection through planning, checking and evaluating activities as early as possible in her school career. Early detection and intervention can overcome many of the problems readers incur (Clay, 1979). The child being more aware of her limitations as a learner can help herself to take active steps to become a more adequate reader.

Indeed the child will benefit from a balanced teaching program of graphophonic knowledge and semantic and syntactic information which focusses attention on the major content rather than trivia.

In conclusion, the effective reader is one who utilizes both top-down and bottom-up processing in concert making compensatory adjustments as the reading task at hand demands.

Top-down processing involves the child relying heavily on her knowledge of oral language to predict words in text, basing this prediction upon minimal visual information. An over-reliance on this procedure generally results in the reader missing the author's intended meaning.

On the other hand, bottom up processing reflects a slow word-by-word or letter-by-letter attention to print whereby the child attempts to sound out words as a main strategy for word identification. Because the reader is overly concerned with the grapho-phonic system, she often is unable to develop an overall meaning for the text. Generally, absent from the child's strategies are predicting and self-monitoring.

In summary then, an overdependence on either top-down or bottom-up processing usually results in faulty reading. The ideal reading behavior is reflected in the reader knowledgeably utilizing and controlling both procedures to derive meaning from print.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Almy, M. (1975). The early childhood educator at work. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.

Almy, M., & Genishi, C. (1979). Ways of studying children. New York: Teachers' College.

Arnaud, S. (1971). Play: The child strives toward self-realization. Washington: National Association for the Education of Young CHildren.

Baker, L, & Brown, A. L. (1984). Metacognitive skills and reading. In David P. Pearson (Ed.), Handbook of reading research (pp. 353-394). Toronto: Longman.

Barbe, W. B., & Milone, Jr., M. N. (1980). Modality. Instructor, 89, 44-47.

Barnes, D. (1976). From communication to curriculum. Harmondsworth: Penguin Education.

Beach, F. A. (1945). Current concepts of play in animals. American Naturalist, 79, 523-541.

Berry, K. (1982). Oral language and learning of grade 5 students. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta.

Beth-Halachmy, S. (1980). Elementary school children's play behavior during school recess periods. In Paul F. Wilkinson (Ed.), Celebration in play (pp.135-144). New York: St. Martin's Press.

Biemiller, A. (1979). Changes in the use of graphic and contextual information as functions of passage difficulty and reading level achievement. Journal of Reading Behavior, 11(4), 307-318.

Bishop, J. (1982). Play therapy: Artistry and destiny and the subject of our destiny. Canadian Counsellor, 17(1), 37-43.

Bloom, B. W. (1953). Thought processes in lectures and discussions. Journal of General Education, 7(3), 160-169.

Bormuth, J. R., Carr, J., Manning, J., & Pearson, P. D. (1970). Children's comprehension of between- and within-sentence syntactic structure. Journal of Educational Psychology, 61, 349-357.

Britton, J. (1973). Language and learning. London: Allen Lane.

Brody, P. J. (1981). Research on pictures in instructional texts: The need for a broadened perspective. Educational Communication and Technology, 29(2), 93-100.

Brown, A. (1975). The development of memory: Knowing, knowing about knowing and knowing how to know. In H. W. Reese (Ed.) Advances in child development and behavior (Vol. 10, pp. 104-152). New York: Academic Press.

Brown, A. L., & Lawton, S. C. (1977). The feeling of knowing experience in educable retarded children. Developmental Psychology, 13, 364-370.

Brown, R. (1958). Words and things. New York: The Free Press.

Bruner, J., Jolly, A., & Sylva, K. (Eds.). (1976). Play: Its role in development and evolution. Harmondsworth: Penguin Education.

Bruner, J. S. (1975). The ontogenesis of speech acts. Journal of Child Language, 2, 1-19.

Caldwell, M. (1959). A survey of methods of beginning instruction in reading from 1900-1950. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta.

Campione, J. C., & Brown, A. L. (1974). The effects of contextual changes and degree of component mastery on transfer of training. In Hayne W. Reese (Ed.), Advances in child development and behavior (Vol. 9, pp. 69-114). New York: Academic Press.

Canney, G., & Winograd, P. (1979). Schemata for reading and reading comprehension performance. (Tech. Rep. No. 120), Urbana: Center for the Study of Reading, University of Illinois.

Cazden, C. B. (1972). Child language and education. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Chall, J. (1983). Learning to read--the great debate (Updated ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.

Cherry, C. (1976). Creative play for the developing child. Belmont: Fearon Pitman Publishers Inc.

Clay, M. M. (1979). Reading, the patterning of complex behavior (2nd ed.). London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Clay, M. M. (1972). The early detection of reading difficulties: a diagnostic survey including full details for the administration of the concepts about print test entitled "SAND". London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Clay, M. M. (1979). The early detection of reading difficulties: A diagnostic survey with recovery procedures. London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Cohen, D., & Stern, V. (1978). Observing and recording the behavior of young children. New York: Teachers' College Press.

Crain, Wm. C. (1980). Theories of development: Concepts and applications. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Cromer, R. F. (1983). The acquisition of word knowledge: Gradual learning or sudden reorganization. In Th. B. Seiler & W. Wannenmacher (Eds.), Concept development and the development of word meaning (pp.34-53). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Davey, B. (1983). Think aloud--Modelling the cognitive processes of reading comprehension. Journal of Reading, 27(1), 44-47.

Davey, B. (1983). Cognitive styles and reading research: Some methodological concerns and future directions. Reading Psychology, 4, 65-77.

Davey, B, & Porter, S. M. (1982). Comprehension-rating: A procedure to assist poor comprehenders. Journal of Reading, 26(3), 197-202.

Dewey, J. (1963). How do we think? Portions published in R. M. Hutchins & M. J. Adler (Eds.), Gateway to the great books (Vol.10), Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., 1963, (originally published by Heath, 1933, 1961).

Dillion, D. A. (1983). Language and learning, learning and teaching. Language Arts, 60(5), 549-552.

Doake, D. B. (1976). New directions for reading teaching: Selected proceedings of the fifth New Zealand Conference on Reading and the fifth World Congress on Reading. Wellington: New Zealand Educational Institute.

Donaldson, M. (1978). Children's minds. New York: W. N. Norton & Co.

Downing, J. (1970a). Children's concept of language in learning to read. Educational Research, 12(2), 106-112.

Downing, J. (1970b). The development of linguistic concepts in children's thinking. Research in the Teaching of English, 4(1), 5-19.

Downing, J. (1976). The reading instruction register. Language Arts, 53(7), 762-766.

Downing, J. (1969). How children think about reading. The Reading Teacher, 23(3), 217-230.

Downing, J. (1971-1972). Children's development concepts of spoken and written language. Journal of Reading Behavior, 4(1), 1-19.

Duffy, G., & Roehler, L. (1983). Comprehension instruction: Perspectives and suggestions. New York: Longmans.

Duffy, G., & Roehler, L. (1982-1983). Direct instruction of comprehension: What does it really mean? Reading Horizons, 23, 35-40.

Durkin, D. (1976). Teaching young children to read (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Durkin, D. (1983). Stages of reading development. New York: McGraw Hill.

Durkin, D. (1981). What is the value of the new interest in reading comprehension? Language Arts, 58(1), 23-43.

Durkin, D. (1981). Schools don't teach comprehension. Educational Leadership, 38(6), 453-454.

Ellis, M. J. (1973). Why people play. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.

Eves, H. (1958). An introduction to the history of mathematics. New York: Rinehart & Co., Inc.

Eves, H., & Newsom, C. (1965). An introduction to the foundations and fundamental concepts of mathematics. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Fagan, W. T. (in preparation). An interactive processes orientation to reading with practical application.

Fagan, W. T., & Hayden, R. (1983). Concept development, clarification strategies, and levels of labelling. Unpublished paper, The University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta.

Feifel, H. (1952). An analysis of the word definition errors of children. The Journal of Psychology, 33, 65-77.

Feifel, H., & Lorge, I. (1950). Qualitative differences in the vocabulary responses of children. The Journal of Educational of Educational Psychology, 41(1), 1-18.

Flavell, J. (1981). The development of comprehension monitoring and knowledge about communication. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press for the Society for Research in Child Development.

Fox, D. J. (1969). The research process in education. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Fox, S. E., & Allen, V. G. (1983). The language arts: An integrated approach. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Freire, P. (1983). The importance of the act of reading. Journal of Education, 165(1), 5-11.

Freud, S. (1965). Introductory lectures on psycho-analysis. New York: W. N. Norton & Co.

Fries, C. C. (1963). Linguistics and reading. New York: Holt, Reinhart & Winston.

Gambrell, L., & Heatherington, B. (1981). Adult disabled readers' metacognitive awareness about reading tasks and strategies. Journal of Reading Behavior, 13(3), 215-222.

Garner, R. (1980). Monitoring of understanding: An investigation of good and poor readers' awareness of induced miscomprehension of text. Journal of Reading Behavior. 12(1), 55-62.

Garner, R., & Kraus, C. (1981 - 1982). Good and poor comprehender differences in knowing and regulating reading behaviors. Educational Research Quarterly, 6(4), 5-12.

Garner, R., & Reis, R. (1980 - 1981). Monitoring and resolving comprehension obstacles: An investigation of spontaneous text lookbacks among upper-grade good and poor comprehenders. Reading Research Quarterly, 16, 569-582.

Garner, R., Wagoner, S., & Smith, T. (1983). Externalizing question-answering strategies of good and poor comprehenders. Reading Research Quarterly, 18(4), 439-447.

Garvey, C. (1977). Play. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gentry, L. A. (1974). A clinical method in classroom success--kinesthetic teaching. The Reading Teacher, 28(3), 298-300.

Gerhard, C. (1975). Making sense: Reading comprehension through categorizing. Newark Delaware: International Reading Association.

Goodman, K. W. (1970). Reading: A psycholinguistic guessing game. In H. Singer & R. B. Ruddell (Eds.), Theoretical models and processes of reading (pp. 259-272). Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.

Goodman, Y. M. (1980). Reading strategies: Focus on comprehension. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Goodman, Y. M., & Burke, C. (1981). Reading strategies: Focus on comprehension. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Gray, W. S. (1938). Contribution of research to special methods: Reading. In Thirty-seventh Yearbook of the national society for the study of education (Part 2). Bloomington, Ill.: Public School Publishing.

Gray, W. S. (1956). Monograph on Fundamental Education United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Russell Square London: Evans Bros. Limited (or UNESCO, Switzerland).

Groos, K. (1976). The play of man. New York: Arno Press.

Hansen, C. (1977). Comments on purpose in reading. In J. T. Guthrie (Ed.), Cognition, curriculum, and comprehension (pp. 65-70). Newark: International Reading Association.

Hardy, M. & Stennet, R. G., & Smyth, P. C. (1974). Development of auditory and visual concepts and relationship to instructional strategies in kindergarten. Elementary English, 57(4), 525-532.

Herron, R. E., & Sutton-Smith, B. (1971). Child's play. New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Hess, A. (1982). An analysis of the cognitive processes underlying problems in reading comprehension. Journal of Reading Behavior, 14(3), 313-333.

Holdaway, D. (1979). The foundations of literacy. Toronto: Ashton Scholastic.

Holmes, B. (1983). A confirmation strategy for improving poor readers' ability to answer inferential questions. The Reading Teacher, 37(2), 144-149.

Huey, E. B. (1908). The psychology and pedagogy of reading. New York: The MacMillan Company.

Huzinga, J. (1949). Homo ludens: A study of the play element in culture. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Jennings, F. G. (1965). This is reading. New York: Teachers' College, Columbia University.

Johns, J. F. (1980). First graders' concept about print. Reading Research Quarterly, 15(4), 529-549.

Johns, J. L. (1977). Children's conception of a spoken word: A developmental study. Reading World, 16(4), 248-257.

Johnson, D. D., & Pearson, D. D. (1978). Teaching reading vocabulary. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Johnston, P. H. (1983). Reading comprehension assessment: A cognitive basis. Newark: International Reading Association.

Judd, C. H., & Buswell, G. T. (1922). Silent reading: A study of the various types (Supplementary Monographs, No. 23). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kavanagh, J., & Mattingly, I. (1972). Language by ear and eye; the relationship between speech and reading. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T.

Koste, V. G. (1978). Dramatic play in childhood: Rehearsal for life. New Orleans: Anchorage Press.

Lapp, D., & Flood, J. (1978). Teaching reading to every child. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co. Inc.

Lim-Alparaque, I. (1983). Understanding of instructional terms in language arts. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta.

Lindfors, J. W. (1980). Children's language and learning. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Lowndes, B. (1970). Movement and drama in the primary school. London: B. T. Batsford.

Markman, E. (1979). Realizing that you don't understand: Elementary school children's awareness of inconsistencies. Child Development, 50, 643-655.

McFetridge, P. A. (1970). Strategies of meaning. Elements, 2(1).

McFetridge, P. A. (1971). Evaluation and Task. Elementary English, 48(2), 203-208.

McIntyre, B. (1974). Creative drama in the elementary school. Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers Inc.

McLaughlin, J. L. (1978). Grade-one children's concepts of purposes for reading and of selected components of written language. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta.

Meyers, M., & Paris, S. (1978). Children's metacognitive knowledge about reading. Journal of Educational Psychology, 70(5), 680-690.

Moffett, J. (1973). A student-centered language arts curriculum grades K-6: A handbook for teachers. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Moore, P. (1983). Aspects of metacognitive knowledge of reading. Journal of Research in Reading, 6(2), 87-102.

Myers, C. A. (1978). Reviewing the literature on Fernald's technique of remedial reading. The Reading Teacher, 31(6), 614-623/

Nicholich, L. M. (1977). Beyond sensorimotor intelligence: Assessment of symbolic maturity through analysis of pretend play. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 23, 89-99.

Pany, D., McCoy, K., & Peters, E. (1981). Effects of corrective feedback on comprehension skills of remedial students. Journal of Reading Behavior, 13(2), 131-143.

Palermo, D. S. (1983). Looking to the future: Theory and Research in language and cognitive development. In Th. B. Seiler & W. Wannenmacher (Eds.), Concept development and the development of word meaning (pp. 297-319). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Parten, M. (1971). Social play among preschool children. In R. E. Herron & Brian Sutton-Smith (Eds.), Child's play (pp. 83-95). New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Pearson, P. D. (1984). Handbook of reading research. New York: Longman.

Pearson, P. D. (1976). A psycholinguistic model of reading. Language Arts, 53(3), 309-316.

Pearson, P. D., & Johnson, D. D. (1978). Teaching reading comprehension. New York: Holt Rinehart & Winston.

Piaget, J. (1969). The language and thought of the child. New York: M.E.R.

Pulaski, M. A. (1973). Toys and imaginative play. In J. L. Singer (Ed.), The child's world of make-believe (pp. 74-103). New York: Academic Press.

Raphael, T. (1984). Teaching learners about sources of information for answering questions. Journal of Reading, 27(4), 303-311.

Reid, J. F. (1966). Learning to think about reading. Educational Research, 9(1), 56-62.

Reilly, M. (1974). Play as exploratory learning. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Riegel, K. F. (1979). Foundations of dialectical psychology. New York: Academic Press.

Robinson, H. A. (1980). Reading instruction for today's children (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Russell, D. H., & Sandeh, I. Q. (1962). Qualitative levels in children's vocabularies. Journal of Educational Psychology, 53, 170-174.

Seiler, Th. B, & Wannenmacher, W. (1983). How can we assess meaning and investigate meaning development: Theoretical and methodological considerations from an epistemological point of view. In Th. B. Seiller, & W. Wannenmacher (Eds.), Concept development and the development of word meaning (pp.320-339). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Siemens, E. (1973). Description: A measure of children's language power. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta.

Siks, G. B. (1983). Drama with children. New York: Harper & Row.

Silvern, S., Williamson, P., & Waters, B. (1983). Play as a mediator of comprehension: An alternative to play training. Educational Research Quarterly, 7(3), 16-21.

Simpson, M. J. (1976). Children's inferential responses to a wordless picture book: Development and use of a classification for verbalized inference. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington). Dissertation Abstracts International, 3 7, 02A.

Singer, J. L. (1973). The child's world of make-believe. New York: Academic Press.

Slade, P. (1967). An introduction to child drama. London: University of London Press Ltd.

Slade, P. (1971). Child drama. London: University of London Press Ltd.

Smilansky, S. (1968). The effects of socio-dramatic play on disadvantaged preschool children. New York: John Wiley.

Smith, F. (1971). Understanding reading. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Smith, F. (1975). Comprehension and learning: A conceptual framework for teachers. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Stewig, J. (1973). Spontaneous drama, a language art. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.

Stoodley, B. (1959). The concepts of Sigmund Frued. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.

Thorndike, E. L. (1917). Reading as reasoning: A study of mistakes in paragraph reading. Journal of Educational Psychology, 8, 323-332.

Thorndyke, P. W. (1977). Cognitive structures in comprehension and memory of narrative discourse. Cognitive Psychology, 9, 77-110.

Tough, J. (1975). Early childhood education: A review and discussion of current research in Britain. Windsor, Berks, England: NFER Publishing Co.

Tovey, D. R. (1979). Writing centres in the elementary school. Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

van Ments, M. (1983). The effective use of role play: A handbook for teachers and trainers. London: Kogan Page Ltd.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). Thought and language. (E. Hemfmann & G. Vakar, Eds. and Trans.). Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, (originally published, 1934).

Wagner, B. J. (1976). Dorothy Heathcote, drama as a learning medium. Washington: National Education Association.

Wagoner, S. (1983). Comprehension monitoring: What it is and what we know about it. Reading Research Quarterly, 18(3), 328-346.

Weininger, O. (1979). Play and education: The basic tool for early childhood learning. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.

Weintraub, S., & Denny, T. (1964-65). What do beginning first graders say about reading? Childhood Education, 41, 326-327.

Werner, H., & Kaplan, E. (1963). Symbol formation. New York: Wiley & Sons.

Werner, H., & Kaplan, E. (1950). The acquisition of word meanings: A developmental study. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 15(1, whole no. 51).

Werner, H., & Kaplan, B. (1967). Symbol formation. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Winograd, P., & Johnson, P. (1982). Comprehension monitoring and error detection paradigm. Journal of Reading Behavior, 14(1), 61-76.

Witman, C. C., & Riley, J. D. (1978). Colored chalk and messy fingers: A kinesthetic-tactile approach to reading. The Reading Teacher, 31(6), 620-623.

Yamomoto, K. (1979). Children in time and space. New York: Teachers College Press.

Yawkey, T., & Trostle, S. (1982). Learning is child's play. Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press.

APPENDIX A

DEFINITIONS OF FEATURES USED IN CLASSIFYING RESPONSES TO QUESTION "A" IN THE VERBAL ASSESSMENT TASK

Appendix A

Definitions of Features Used in Classifying Responses to Question "A" in the Verbal Assessment Task

1. Descriptive--A feature within a response which includes details and aspects that characterize the target term.

2. Functional--A feature incorporated in a response showing the "use of" the target term.

3. Exemplar--A feature which includes an example of the target term.

4. Synonym--A feature which indicates another word or expression which represents a similar meaning of that of the target term.

5. Antonym--A feature which indicates another word or expression which represents meaning opposite to that of the target term.

6. Circular--A feature included within the response which simply gives a meaning for the target term by repeating the term.

7. Don't know/no response--Features which includes "I don't know," no response, incorrect responses and "I forget" answers.

APPENDIX B

INTRODUCTION OF E.T. AND PROJECT

Appendix B

Introduction of E.T. and Project

I have had five babies and this is the one one that has not cried (Children Yah E.T.). Now if E.T. were to come into this classroom, what are some of the things that he would have to learn? I would like you to think of some of those things over the next few days because you are going to be teaching E.T. I would also like you to think of someone you might like to have as a partner. You will be audio-taped on a cassette recorder and video-taped for television and what you say will be part of a book that I am writing. Now, I want you to think about whom you might like to work with in addition to what things E.T. needs to be taught. Remember that you will be the teachers. You will decide as a class on two things to teach E.T. In addition, I want you to teach E.T. how to read.

APPENDIX C

NARRATIVES FROM

"ON CHERRY STREET"

AND "RAINBOW LETTERS"

Appendix C

Narratives from "On Cherry Street" and "Rainbow Letters"

Gardens by the Brook

"This is a good day," said Mrs. Bear.
"I am going to plant a garden."

"So am I," said Mrs. Rabbit.
"I will plant a cabbage garden."

"I like wheat better than cabbage," said Mr. Fox.
"I will plant wheat in my garden."

"I like corn," said Mr. Squirrel.
"I will plant some pop corn."

Mrs. Bear said nothing.
She just went to work.
The others did not know what she was going to plant.
They said to her, "What will be in your garden?"

Something good!" said Mrs. Bear.
"It will not be cabbage.
It will not be corn or wheat.
I will plant something better than that.
You shall see! You shall see!

Mrs. Rabbit worked and worked in her garden.
Soon her little cabbages were big cabbages.

Mr. Fox did not like to work, but he did like to eat.
So he worked and worked, too.

Little Mr. Squirrel did like to work in his garden.
"See my corn," he called.
"How is your garden, Mrs. Bear?"

"I have a good garden," said Mrs. Bear.
"I have a flower garden!"
I shall have flowers of all colours."

"Flowers!" said Mr. Squirrel.
"What a funny garden!"

"Flowers!" said Mr. Fox
"You cannot eat flowers!"

Mrs. Bear laughed and laughed.
Then she went on with her work.
The others went back to work, too.

"Flowers!" said Mrs. Rabbit.
"Nothing ut flowers!
Just flowers!
What will Mrs. Bear eat?"

The bees saw Mrs. Bear's flower garden.
"Flowers," they buzzed.
Soon all the bees found out about the flowers.
How happy they were!
How they buzzed around Mrs. Bear's garden!

"Let's make honey!" they buzzed.
"Good honey! Good honey!"

How the bees worked!
How the bees buzzed!

Mrs. Rabbit, Mr. Squirrel, and Mr. Fox had a picnic by the brook.
Mrs. Rabbit ate her cabbage.
It was good cabbage.
Mr. Fox ate his wheat cake.
It was a good wheat cake.
Mr. Squirrel had several ears of corn.
He was going to pop it over a fire.

"I see Mrs. Bear," said Mr. Fox.
"Come to the picnic," he called.
"There is nothing to eat in your garden."

How Mrs. Bear laughed!
"Look at the honey," she said.
"It came from my flower garden.
Bees make honey from flowers.
Did you know that?
Now I have honey to eat."

"Honey!" they all said.
"You have honey to eat, Mrs. Bear.
That was a good garden you had after all!"

Rainbow Letters

Peter and the Goats

Peter had three frisky goats.
Each day the goats leaped and skipped high on a hillside.
Every night Peter went to get the goats, and drive them home.

One night, on the way home, the goats jumped into a turnip field.
Try as he might, he couldn't get them out.
There they were and there they stayed.

Peter sat down and began to cry.
As he sat there a rabbit came along.
"Why are you crying?" asked the rabbit.
"I am crying because I can't get the goats out of the turnip field,"
sighed Peter.

"I run very fast," said the rabbit, "I'll get the goats out."
So he tried and tried, but the goats would not come out.
Then the rabbit sat down beside Peter and began to cry too.

In a little while a fox came along.
"Why are you crying?" asked the fox.
"I am crying because Peter is crying," said the rabbit.
"Peter is crying because he can't get the goats out of the turnip field."

"I am very clever," said the fox, "I'll get the goats out."
So the fox tried and he tried and he tried.
But the goats would not come out.
Then the fox sat down beside the rabbit and began to cry too.

In a little while, a bee came buzzing over the hill.
"Why are you crying?" buzzed the bee.
"I am crying because the rabbit is crying," said the fox.
"The rabbit is crying because Peter is crying.
Peter is crying because he can't get the goats out of the turnip field."
"Well crying won't help," said the bee.
"I'm not clever and I can't run, but I'll get the goats out."

Then the clever fox, the fast rabbit and Peter stopped crying.
They began to make fun of the little bee.
"You get the goats out, when we couldn't?
That's a joke!"
But the little bee buzzed right into the turnip field.
"Buzz- buzz- buzzz."
Then out ran the goats--every one!

APPENDIX D

CHILDREN'S SUGGESTIONS FOR ROLE PLAYING ACTIVITIES

Appendix D

Children's Suggestions for Role Playing Activities

1. teach E.T. to talk
2. math
3. sing O'Canada
4. raise your hand (rules)
5. phys. ed.
6. spell words
7. don't make noise in classroom (rules)
8. hold pencil properly
9. don't eat in classtime (rules)
10. how to print
11. art
12. learn to tell date
13. learn numbers and alphabet
14. how to play games
15. rules for recess
16. different school rules
17. remember where things are
18. how to keep desk clean
19. don't run in school
20. how to walk

Each group's secretary reported the following decisions (choices):

Row I - learn to talk
- don't make noise

Row II - learn numbers and alphabet
- spelling words

Row III - math, art

Row IV - print
- learn to talk

Row V - learn to talk
- math

The researcher decided arbitrarily in economy of time to place these suggestions into a container and the teacher selected two slips of paper at random. The final topics for role playing activities were:

- how to print

- don't make noise.

It was also suggested by the class that the general topic "rules" could be utilized instead of "don't make noise."

APPENDIX E

DESCRIPTION OF STUDENT SAMPLE

Appendix E

Description of Student Sample

Name	N.P.	S	Name	N.P.	S	
Karl	75	M	Sharol	81	M	Pilot
Louise	48	F	Tamara	18	F	Pilot
Andrew	84	M	Sonny	40	M	Main
Krystal	42	F	Jane	34	F	Main
Ann	78	F	Nicole	87	F	Main
Samuel	81	M	Ralph	34	M	Main
John	67	M	Mitchell	42	M	Main
Brenda	36	F	Junella	75	F	Main
Mary	67	F	Bernice	34	F	Main
Kristopher	59	M	Charles	73	M	Main
June	53	F	Winnifred	73	F	Main
Elaine	26	F	Candice	48	F	Main
David	44	M	Betty	93	F	Main
Mark	59	F	Cordelaine	48	M	Main
Ellen	61	F	Maria	54	F	Main
Missy	28	F	Teresa	91	F	Main
Rolph	57	M	Junior	77	M	Main
Sandy	59	M	Roland	54	M	Main
Susan	99	F	Theresa	91	F	Main
Chester	99	M	Darwin	20	M	Main
Sharmaine	73	F	Charlene	67	F	
Ricki	53	M	Jason	28	M	Main
Raymond	87	M	Stanley	53	M	
Jan	44	M	Karl	28	M	Main
Robin	44	M	Charles	20	M	
Claude	11	M	Jim	64	M	
Darwin	50	M	Mathew	13	M	
Reginald	32	M	Julian	30	M	

APPENDIX F

TWO COMPLETE PERFORMANCES

Appendix F

Two Complete Performances

First Episode of Group 7

E.T., my name is Mary

My name is Bernice.

Mary: We're going to teach you reading. E.T. can you read this to me or else I'll read it to you. "Gardens by the Brook."

(Girls alternated oral reading after a whispered conferencing.)

Mary: Okay, E.T., we're going to go back to the front page. Let me ask you what this word is. Okay, what is this here word? Do you know what that word is, it's "this." And if you want to know how to read you have to say the whole sentence. '"This is a good day,' said Mrs. Bear."

Bernice: Okay, E.T., this is another word you should learn. And this is the word "rabbit," right here. You shouldn't say "Ms." it says "Mrs. Rabbit."

Mary: Okay, here is a sentence. I said, "'I like corn,' said Mr. Squirrel." You don't say "Mrs." because then you'll be wrong. You only say "Mr. Squirrel."

Bernice: You say "Mr. Fox" you don't say "Mrs."

Mary: And now I'll tell you the word back here and it is buzz. If you ever see bees don't swat it or kick it or anything. Just try to walk away and don't have sweet stuff like chocolate bars and stuff like that and honey. We did a play called "Bears Like Honey" and I was the little bear.

Bernice: And bees work really hard and they really work hard and cooperate to make the honey for the people.

Mary: You don't say "laugh" you say "laughed" (emphasized suffix). And there's another word at this front page is "across." You don't say "acrossed," you say "across"--not "acro," you say "across." And so then you would have to say "popcorn" or "pop" and then "corn."

Bernice: This word is jumped. You can say "jump." If you don't if you just added "ed" you don't say "jump," you say "jumped."

Mary: This word is "dinner" and the other one is "cabbage." You don't say "ca." That means that it's a cab like what you ride in. All you say is "cabbage." And the other one is "dinner." You don't say "din." And the next one is "flowers"--you don't say "flower."

Bernice: And this word "nothing." You don't just say "noth" or else it doesn't make sense. You just have to add an "ing." It says "nothing" and there's another work like, uhm, "squirrel." You don't just say "squir." You have to say "squir-rel."

Mary: The next one is, this here word is "bear" and the other is "rabbit." You don't say "rab."

Bernice: Okay, this is "buzz." You don't say "bzz." You can say "bzz." When bees buzz, you can say "bzz." You don't say go, you say "good."

Mary: You don't say "foun." You say "found."

Bernice: You don't say "pic," you say "picnic."

Mary: The words "about" and "flowers." About the "flowers," you don't say "flower," you say "flowers."

Second Episode

Mary: Hi, E.T. My name is Mary.

Bernice: And my name is Bernice.

Mary: We'll be doing you some lessons again. This time we'll be going "garden." Why are you in the garden?

Bernice: Now E.T., we're gonna do another word and now we're gonna do "this." This is the word "this."

Mary: Now we're gonna be doing "rabbit." How many rabbits do you have? "Rabbit."

Bernice: Okay, now there's another word, it's a word "good." This is a word "good." See, E.T.?

Mary: I want to show you these, okay, E.T.? E.T., what is this word? The word is "aaa--across." Across means that when you go across a thing.

Bernice: A bridge.

Mary: A bridge, a bridge, a bridge.

Bernice: Or a mountain, like.

Mary: Or a brook, okay?

Bernice: Okay, E.T. Now okay, I'll learn you another word. This is the word "fox." Mr. Fox went out on a journey, like.

Mary: Okay, now the next one is, the next one would be . . . will be, um, "again." "Again" means when somebody do, does it again.

Bernice: Now, E.T., and this is the word "brook." See the word "brook." Like a brook or round a pond or something.

Mary: The next work is "ducks." The ducks went a long, long way.

Bernice: Now, E.T. Now, E.T., we're gonna have another word for you. Okay, how the bees worked. It's "worked." Like the bees worked really hard for honey.

Mary: And the next, and the next one is "dinner." Dinner is the best thing.

Bernice: And E.T., this is the word "honey." It's good for breakfast, on your toast.

Mary: Uhm. Okay, the next word is . . . the next word is "buzzed." The bees buzzed all day.

Bernice: Now, E.T. I've got another one, "laughed." How Mr. Bear laughed and the, like the fox and the other animals think they were so . . . they think they were right but they were wrong.

Mary: And last . . . and the next one is "flowers." Flowers smell so sweet.

Bernice: Okay, now, E.T. I've got another word for you. It's in the front page . . ."jump." Like the rabbit jumped up over the bridge. Jumped over the bridge. Okay, now. Now, E.T., we're going to do the word "corn." Corn is good for you for supper and something else. now, E.T., the word is "squirrel."

Mary: Next word would be "bear."

Bernice: Okay, E.T., now we're . . . we're going to, okay, sorry, E.T.

Mary: E.T., I'm going to do you a sentence and when I'm doing the sentence, Brenda will give you a name. "'This is a good day,' said Mrs. Bear."

Bernice: Like, so am I. Okay, E.T. Now we're gonna have to do something else. See it's like a . . . it's like a . . . it's a sentence. See somebody's talking see. "I will plant some cabbage."

Mary: and then when someone says "no." You don't have to get so mad like NO!!! And then if someone said, "Why are you?" you don't have to make such a fuss.

Bernice: Now, the word we're going to . . . now, the word, you know XXX . . . plant some popcorn. Okay, E.T., like a magical air . . . like a magical . . .

Mary: Dream. E.T., I'm going to say something before her. (They draw on paper.)

Bernice: That's good, E.T.

Mary: Yah.

Bernice: Now we're going to draw something else for you. Okay, E.T., now we're going to do a clap. See clap (claps hands together.)

Mary: Clap (claps hands).

Bernice: Snap (snaps fingers).

Mary: Snap (snaps fingers).

Bernice: And blink (blinks). And we're going to do something else. Okay, E.T., stamp your feet. (Stamps feet, Maria stamped too.) Now we're going to do a little tune. (They try to make a tune by making clapping, snapping, stamping sounds.) Now we better get to work now, E.T. For you've a lot more fun. Now the word "sun." Now, it means that the sun is bright.

Mary: "Sun" and its spelled S-U-N.

Bernice: Okay, E.T., now we're going to teach him a little . . . a little word, "love" (clasps arms across chest).

Mary: Love.

Bernice: It's spelled L-O-V-E.

Mary: And the next one is "bike." Bike is something that somebody rides.

Bernice: On the road or in your driveway. You'll have to ride on the XXX on the side of the street.

Mary: Plus like . . . if you were being right here (draws on paper and if a car just came right beside you, you could be hurt. You have to go right there.

Bernice: 'Cause if you go into the middle of the road and a car is going (makes car sound) and do you know what happens. The word is "watch out." You have to watch out because you know why, because you have to be good. And you don't wanna run out in front else you get flat and you'll be in the hospital. Okay, E.T., the word is "be--be--be careful" and watch out."

Episode I

First Episode of Group 4

Ralph: Hi. My name is Roland.

Samuel: My name is Samuel.

Ralph: Okay, E.T. You know what that says?

Samuel: No (uses E.T. voice).

Ralph: "O" and "n" makes "on," okay.

Samuel: Okay (E.T. voice).

Ralph: You know what that one is?

Samuel: Okay, E.T., here. This is "o" makes the o (ah) sound and then but sometimes "o" can be o (oh) sound too. And the "n" just makes the "nnn" sound. And there's no such word as "n."

Ralph: Okay.

Samuel: Yah. And there's no such word as "n", okay.

Ralph: Okay, E.T. This is "the."

Samuel: The.

Ralph: "T-H" together sounds like this (makes "th" sound). "E" is just "ah." And sometimes it can say e too. But you need a "magic e" at the end or an "a" after it or something like that.

Samuel: And then it would sound like a.

Ralph: You know what the . . . the next word is "waay."

Samuel: Way. Okay, so it's . . .

Ralph: That.

Samuel: Like this: "On the way" and then this is "to" but "On the way to his nap."

Ralph: Yah.

Samuel: There it says . . . and this is "nap." Okay. I'm just going to read this whole sentence.

Ralph: Okay XXX.

Samuel: (Reads.) Oh, Garfield's the name of the cat.

Ralph: Okay, you see that? That's "On the way to his nap the other day." You see that, E.T.? Okay, now you try and read it. (Boys read together with Samuel using an E.T. voice.) Okay, this is come.

Samuel: Poukee's the name of the teddy bear.

Ralph: Yah. (Both boys read a few words.)

Samuel: Okay, now you try and read the whole thing, okay? (Ralph reads using E.T. voice.) Now okay. Now do this page and this page. (Ralph continues reading.) That's very good. Now work on the second page.

Ralph: Okay, we might have to . . .

Samuel: You can look at the pictures, too. You see that's Garfield in the sun, sleeping.

Ralph: Okay, that's Gaar-field. Garfield. Okay.

Samuel: Okay, I'll read it to him.

Ralph: Let him see the words, too.

Samuel: Yah. "Garfield and Poukee."

Ralph: No, we have to show him again. That's Garfield and . . .

Samuel: He knows all that, remember.

Ralph: Poukee.

Samuel: We told him.

Ralph: Set.

Samuel: Set. Settled.

Ralph: Okay, you got that. That's "I" and that's "love" and that's "sunbeam."

Both: Sunbeam.

Ralph: Okay.

Samuel: and that's "you." Now what?

Ralph: When you're finished, just go over it slowly and show him the different words. Okay. (Samuel reads from text.) "Where am I?"

Ralph: That's what he said, Okay. (Both boys read together.) Now you see those, see those words.

Samuel: Yah.

Ralph: No.

Samuel: Yah, I see them.

Ralph: That's Garfield.

Samuel: Oh, you mean E.T.

Ralph: That's Garfield. You know that one, don't you?

Samuel: Yah.

Ralph: XXX and you can teach him the next one, okay.

Samuel: Okay, heard, I mean.

Ralph: I didn't know that one. XXX. Oh, I know that one.

Samuel: Yah.

Ralph: XXX lots of people do that.

Samuel: Yah, okay, now.

Ralph: This page. Oh that's nothing. Let's go. Oh, you know all those words.

Samuel: Yah, oh, uhm, he doesn't know. (Reads a fierce looking dragon.) That doesn't say that.

Ralph: It does. (Continued to read.) Look at him. That's a funny picture, isn't it?

Samuel: Yah.

Ralph: I'll make a deal with you. You read on this page and I'll read on this page. Okay.

Samuel: See, that's "Odee." You like this story better than the one those other people were teaching you.

Ralph: Yah. This story's funnier, too.

Samuel: Okay. (Reads.) Huh, Dragon Dog. (Continues reading.)

Ralph: I didn't know that one. (Samuel continues to read.) See that one. (Samuel continues to read.) Hey, I'm supposed to read that. (Boys continue to read.) See that! Dear Step. That's Garfield saying "Drats."

Samuel: Drats.

Ralph: Okay, change the page.

Samuel: Look at the dragon, E.T. Look at the dragon.

Episode II

Ralph: E.T., you look over here. I said, look. (E.T. falls.) Not that closely. Not on the book. Peter. Can you hold on to him, he doesn't want to sit up. Peter, see the "e," it says Pe (writes it out).

Samuel (E.T.): Hey, Ralph.

Ralph: Oh, no. Let's just teach you without the paper.

Samuel (E.T.): Ralph.

Ralph: You'll never guess what happened. The pen just ran out of ink.

Samuel (E.T.): Hey, Ralph, can I read the book?

Ralph: Okay.

Samuel (E.T.): I know how to read now. Remember, you taught me.

Ralph: See, that's "Peter."

Samuel: He knows.

Ralph: See that "e." Do you know why it's an "e?" Because there's an "e" there.

Samuel: He knows that.

Ralph: Remember, it's Peter.

Samuel: You know that one, don't you?

Ralph: And the Goats.

Samuel (E.T.): I can read.

Ralph: And the Goats.

Samuel (E.T.): I can read. Goody, goody, goody.

Ralph: Now XXX, wait until you're in school.

Samuel (E.T.): Oh, no, I hate school.

Ralph: We go to school and is it ever boring.

Samuel: Let's see E.T. Too much work to be boring.

Samuel (E.T.): Peter and the Goats. (Reading) . . . Each day the goats le . . .

Ralph: Leapt. Good E.T. Excellent reading, E.T.

Samuel (E.T.): (Reads.) Now ever night Peter went to get the goats and drive them home.

Ralph: No, No—not that, the next line.

Samuel (E.T.): (Reads.) One night on the way home.

Ralph: See that's "home."

Samuel (E.T.): (Reads.) . . . a goat didn't jump.

Ralph: No, the goats jumped into a turnip field. See that's "the" T-H-E (spells) goats jumped not didn't jump into a turnip field.

Samuel (E.T.): Okay, can I read that now? (Reads.) The goats jumped into a turnip field.

Ralph: Okay, that's good.

Together: There they were and there they stayed (E.T. said stepped) stepped.

Samuel (E.T.): Okay, stayed, stayed. It's not my fault that I can't read that good. This is a grade one book. It's not a kindergarten book. (Reads.) Peter sat down to begin to, . . . Oh, I forgot something.

Ralph: And began to cry.

Samuel (E.T.): Peter sat down and began to cry. Boo hoo. I am crying "bewas."

Ralph: Because.

Samuel (E.T.): Oh, can you point that out to me, it sounds like "bewas."

Ralph: It has a "c" in it.

Samuel (E.T.): Because. Oh, I got it, because.

Samuel: Okay, from now on we're just going to tell E.T. to stop and we're going to ask him to sound out the word. Okay?

Ralph: Yep.

Samuel (E.T.): (Reads.) I've been crying.

Ralph: No read here.

Samuel (E.T.): Oh, sorry, sorry. (Continues to read.) I think I missed some.

Ralph: No, he didn't, no.

Samuel (E.T.): (Reads.) Sighed Peter. Is that right? Is that right?

Ralph: Yah.

Samuel (E.T.): (Continues to read.)

Ralph: Remember, I told you anytime you don't know the words, just stop and sound them out, okay.

Samuel (E.T.): Oh, yah. (Reads.) Said the rabbu.

Ralph: Stop and sound the word out.

Samuel (E.T.): Rah bit, rabbit.

Ralph: That's good, you got that one, rabbit.

Samuel (E.T.): (Continues to read from text.) Get the goats out of the--out of--out. I said that because it sounded right.

Ralph: Yah.

Samuel (E.T.): So he tried and tried but the grits.

Ralph: Goats.

Samuel (E.T.): G--oats.

Ralph: Goats, yah.

Samuel (E.T.): Are you following along?

Ralph: Yah.

Samuel (E.T.): Where are we by the way?

Ralph: About here. Now what did you just read?

Samuel (E.T.): You mean E.T. . . . be--side.

Ralph: Yah.

Samuel (E.T.): "Bewas" to cry.

Ralph: You had the first little bit--you had the ending wrong.

Samuel (E.T.): (Continues to read.)

Ralph: You're on the wrong page.

Samuel (E.T.): Oh, I read the story before. I memorized it, that's all and I sort of took a peek over at your book. (Continues to read.)

Ralph: Good, E.T., you read that page with no mistakes.

Samuel (E.T.): (Continues to read.)

Ralph: Yah, you made one mistake.

Samuel (E.T.): Where?

Ralph: You forgot to say turnip fields.

Samuel (E.T.): Sorry, I never seen that.

Ralph: That's okay.

Samuel (E.T.): (Continues to read.)

Ralph: You forgot the other "and he tried."

Samuel (E.T.): (Continues to read.)

Ralph: Oh, you missed something.

Samuel (E.T.): What?

Ralph: Turnip fields. You know that word don't you?

Samuel (E.T.): Yep, turnip fields. (Reads.) They began to wake.

Ralph: Make.

Samuel (E.T.): Make fun m--ăk f--ŭn (sounds out words).

Ralph: Do you want to just review some of these words you're having trouble with?

Samuel (E.T.): Yah.

Ralph: I wish I had a pen but I don't. Oh, there's one. Okay just a second, I'll go get it. You tell me the words and I'll just sound them out with E.T.

Samuel (E.T.): Hold it. I'll print and you tell me the words.

Ralph: Okay, I'll just explain it to E.T. while you do it on paper. You hold up E.T., okay? E.T., why are you so tired?

Samuel (E.T.): I stayed up last night.

Ralph: Because--be--see there's an "e" on the end which makes it sound /bē cāh z/ (sounds it out). E.T., look over here and see how you spell it. Okay--B-E (says letter names). Since he learned the alphabet I'll just spell it because you know what they are cause I taught you the alphabet.

Samuel: No, we never had enough time to teach you all the sounds.

Ralph: Yah, I did.

Samuel: You taught him all the sounds? Oh, I thought you didn't.

Ralph: Yah, that's an "e" sound because it's on the end and "b" sound like /bah/ "ca" "c" and "a" together say /cah/ "u" too and "se" sounds /z/. So it ends up "because."

Samuel: Oh, yah.

Ralph: "Beside," where's "beside." Okay, let's look for "beside" and see it. I mean "begun." "Begun" is a jail word. You have to learn it--those words--be-gun. Okay, let's spell it: b-e-g-u-n. "Beside." That's "beside," "be" because there's an "e" on the end and ST because there's an "e" on the end there. Beside--be-side. Beside.

Samuel (E.T.): Okay, I know that one.

Ralph: Now, tried. See there's another thing--tri "i" that an /i/ because there's an "e" right next to it. Remember the vowels are, a-e-i-o-u. Okay, and when there's two vowels together it usually makes it's own name, okay. Okay, let's take "Peter." Let's find Peter here, okay. There's Peter--"p." Then you put "r" on there to make /er/. Okay, Pe--ter. What else are you having trouble with?

Samuel (E.T.): Goats. Where's goats?